#### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

A NATIONAL DIALOGUE: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION'S COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2005

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Commission met at 8:45 a.m. in the Atrium Ballroom of the Washington Court Hotel, 525 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., Charles Miller, Chairman, presiding.

#### COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARGARET SPELLINGS, Secretary,

U.S. Department of Education

CHARLES MILLER, Chairman, Former Chairman of the Board of Regents, University of Texas System

NICHOLAS DONOFRIO, Executive Vice President,

Innovation and Technology, IBM Corporation

JAMES J. DUDERSTADT, President *Emeritus*, University of Michigan; Director, The Millennium Project

GERRI ELLIOTT, Corporate Vice President, Worldwide Public Sector, Microsoft Corporation

JONATHAN GRAYER, Chairman and CEO, Kaplan, Inc.

JAMES B. HUNT, JR., Chairman, Hunt Institute for Educational Policy and Leadership;
Former Governor of North Carolina

ARTURO MADRID, Murchison Distinguished Professor of Humanities, Trinity University

ROBERT MENDENHALL, President,

Western Governors University

CHARLENE R. NUNLEY, President, Montgomery College

ARTHUR J. ROTHKOPF, Senior Vice President and

Counselor to the President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; President *Emeritus*, Lafayette College

RICHARD (RICK) STEPHENS, Senior Vice-President,
Human Resources and Administration,
The Boeing Company

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

#### COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: (cont.)

- LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, President *Emeritus*, Morehouse School of Medicine; Former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER, President and CEO, Hispanic Scholarship Fund
- RICHARD VEDDER, Adjunct Scholar, American Enterprise Institute; Distinguished Professor of Economics, Ohio University
- CHARLES M. VEST, President *Emeritus*,

  Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- DAVID WARD, President, American Council on Education ROBERT M. ZEMSKY, Chair and Professor, The Learning Alliance for Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania

### **EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- SAMUEL W. BODMAN, Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy
- EMILY STOVER DEROCCO, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor
- JOHN M. MOLINO, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Military Community and Family Policy, U.S. Department of Defense
- MICHELLE O'NEILL, Acting Under Secretary for Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce
- RAYMOND L. ORBACH, Director Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy
- SALLY L. STROUP, Assistant Secretary, Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

CHERYL OLDHAM, Executive Director,

The Secretary of Education's Commission on the
Future of Higher Education

# A-G-E-N-D-A

Welcome and introductions 4
Swearing in and remarks by
Remarks by Secretary of Energy
Remarks by Chairman Charles Miller21
Roundtable Discussion30
Press Availability
Break for Lunch
Executive Director Update121
Briefing on the Federal Advisory
Wrap Up and Adjourn

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

9:32 a.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Good morning, I'm Charles Miller the designated chairman of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Since we're not sworn in, this is an ad hoc announcement. I'm delighted and honored to introduce the Secretary of Education of the United States, Margaret Spellings.

SECRETARY SPELLINGS: Thank you all. I'm going to make everybody official, so this - you'll be ad hoc no longer. So, everyone stand up and raise your right hand. Good deal. Everyone followed instructions so far. State your name after I say, "state your name."

I, state your name, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of United States against all enemies, foreign and That I will bear true faith and allegiance domestic. the same, that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office of which I am about to enter. So help me God.

All right, have a seat. Well done. Good morning, thank you all for being here. It's an honor

to be at your first meeting, your maiden voyage of the recently appointed Commission on the Future of Higher Education and I thank all of you for agreeing to serve on this important commission.

In your ranks today are University Presidents, CEOs, policy makers, and researchers. You're all here because you share a common passion for improving higher education and you have the courage to reflect on what we're doing well and what we can do better.

I also want to thank my friend Secretary Bodman for joining us today. At the Federal level, education isn't just а priority for Department of Education; it's an issue that affects every aspect of government from commerce to energy, from labor to defense. And that's why I've asked eight Federal agencies to participate on the commission. We all have a stake.

Let me give a special thanks to my friend Charles Miller for chairing this commission. He's the former chair of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas system as well as a successful businessman who knows what's needed to succeed in the twenty-first century. He has a great perspective on how well Universities are preparing students for the future.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

As you all likely remember, in April 1983 we awoke to the news that America was a nation at risk. Thanks to a rising tide of mediocrity in our public primary and secondary schools. Overnight, the report turned education reform into a hot topic of conversation and a front page story. And while a nation at risk certainly didn't have all the right answers, it started a national debate that helped pave the way for higher standards, accountability, No Child Left Behind, and ultimately, improved achievement for all children.

It's now time to launch a national dialogue on our shared vision for higher education. But, let me begin this conversation by saying that the circumstances are far different from the ones that led to a nation at risk. Rather than facing a tide of mediocrity, we are starting our discussion with the finest system of higher education in the world. And, of course, we must continue to make sure that that's the case in this ever-changing world.

Our decentralized system has empowered students with a wide range of options from large universities to community colleges to vocational and technical schools and from public institutions to private and religious ones. These schools compete for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

the best students, here and abroad, and every year hundreds of thousands of students from around the world come to our country to take advantage of these opportunities.

The system has helped spread our democratic ideals abroad and strengthen them here, at It has helped America become the center of innovation and the world's leading economic importantly, it political power. More has given millions of Americans the chance to realize their potential, live the American dream, and contribute in the public and private sectors.

As I said in Charlotte last month with Governor Hunt, whom I am delighted is serving on this commission, I've convened this group to ensure that America remains the world's leader in higher education and innovation. We are at a crossroads. The world is For example, according catching up. to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development or OECD, among young adults Canada, Japan, Korea, Finland, Norway, and Sweden all have higher college graduation rates than we do. And we're not keeping pace with the demand for skilled labor in the new high-tech economy. In 1970 America produced more than fifty percent of the world's science and engineering

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

doctorates. But if current trends continue, by 2010, not very far away, we will produce only around fifteen percent.

China now graduates more engineers than the United States, Japan, and Germany combined. As a result, U.S. high-tech companies are seeking employees abroad. Not just because they can be paid less, but also because they're often more skilled and more motivated. These companies are not just following the money, they are following the brains.

As Tom Friedman says in his bestseller, "The World is Flat," our students are facing an education and an ambition gap and we're on the wrong side of the gap. Or as President and CEO of Cisco Systems, John Chambers flatly put it, "We are not competitive." Our students need better critical thinking skills and better training to compete in a world where what you know means much more than where you live.

In today's global economy, about eighty percent of the fastest growing jobs require post-secondary education. And on average, college graduates earn almost twice as much as workers with just a high school diploma. Meanwhile, less than a third of Americans have Bachelor's degrees. In other

2.3

words, a college education is more important than ever and too few Americans, especially too few African-American and Hispanic Americans, have one.

As a nation, we have always answered the call to extend the promise of higher education to more Americans. It is part of our Nation's commitment to expanding the American dream. And the Federal government has helped pave the way with farsighted leadership at critical points during our history.

In 1862, in the midst of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act creating land-grant colleges to meet the needs of an increasingly industrialized nation. In 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the G.I. Bill providing millions of returning servicemen with the chance to attend college.

And when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik in 1957, Dwight D. Eisenhower responded with an unprecedented national investment in math and science education and research that secured America's place as the world's leader in innovation. And during the Civil Rights movement, Lyndon Johnson helped make the dream of college more affordable for millions of students by signing the Higher Education Act of 1965, which is again before Congress for reauthorization as

2.3

we speak.

2.0

2.1

2.3

As we prepare to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Higher Education Act next month, we must look to the future. Ten, twenty years down the road what legacy will we leave? Today there is no Sputnik to galvanize America into action. But the need for national leadership is no less urgent.

As taxpayers, we all have a stake in our higher education system. Many people don't realize that Federal dollars, including funds for research, make up about one third of our nation's total annual investment in higher education. By comparison, the Federal government's investment in K-12 education represents less than ten percent of total spending.

But, unlike K-12 education we don't really ask many questions about what we're getting for our investment in higher education. And as a result, we're missing valuable information on how the system works today and what can be improved. For instance, at the U.S. Department of Education we can tell you almost anything you want to know about first time, full-time, degree-seeking, non-transfer students. The trouble is that over half of today's college students are non-traditional students.

The absence of good, sound data makes it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

difficult to set policy at the Federal, State, and institutional levels. We often end up having to take a wait and see approach. We spend the money and hope for the best and because we typically don't follow up, it actually becomes a wait and never sees approach. We make small fixes with programs to emphasize key areas, but we don't think strategically about the bigger picture.

Ne can't afford to leave the future of our nation's higher education system to chance. It is time to examine how we can maximize our investment in higher education including our Federal dollars. We all have a responsibility to make sure our higher education system continues to spur innovation and economic growth, and gives more Americans the chance to succeed in the new knowledge economy.

A critical part of that depends on us doing a better job of preparing students for college. A recent study from ACT found that fewer than half of high school students graduate ready for college level math and science. That's why President Bush and I are supporting high school reform that focuses on core subjects like reading, math, and science. We've already seen what а tremendous difference high standards and accountability have made for our younger

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

students and we must extend those same principles into our high schools.

As we improve the quality of high school education, more and more students will graduate ready for college. Our higher education system needs to have a place for these students if they choose to continue their education. We should send students a clear message: If you work hard in school, you can go to college regardless of how much money you or your family has.

It is time to have a discussion on how we can meet rising enrollment numbers and new economic So I ask you to focus your work on four key accessibility, affordability, accountability, areas: and quality. Please address such questions as: How accessible is higher education, and who will be the college student of tomorrow? Why is the cost of college rising so rapidly and how can we make it more How well are institutions of higher affordable? education preparing our students for the work force of the twenty-first century? Will our students have the skills to be leaders in the public and private How do we know what we're getting for our sectors? investments in higher education? How can we ensure America remains the world's leader in innovation and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

#### research?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

I have asked you to submit a final report to me by August 1st of next year with specific findings and recommendations. As you all know, in recent years there have been many good reports and studies different aspects of higher education produced by National Commission groups such the as Accountability in Higher Education, the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education, and the Council on Competitiveness among others. It is time to review this work and build on the results. We must take stock of where we stand and move forward.

I recently dropped off my oldest daughter at college to begin her freshmen year. It was the end of a long process that started with me thumbing quides bookstore through college at the information. As a mom, I know parents and students have questions about higher education. Choosing a college isn't like buying a car or booking a vacation. It is one of the most important decisions families and young adults will ever make not to mention maybe one of the most expensive.

At dinner tables across the country, families are talking about how much college costs and whether it will be available for their children,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

whether their children will be prepared. We must address these concerns and we will expand the conversation to ask what we, as a nation, want from our very fine higher education system. What do we Americans expect from our higher education system?

We all have a role to play in the private and public sectors as well as at the Federal, State, and community levels. I need your honest advice and leadership on this issue. Throughout our history, we've supported and strengthened higher education as a way of expanding the promise of the American dream. And together, with your help, I know we will continue to strengthen that great promise. Thank you very much.

Now, I'd like to turn the podium over to my friend, Sam Bodman. Secretary Bodman has a long background in higher education both as a student and as a professor and on a governing board. He earned his doctorate in science from MIT and also has worked as a professor at that University. He is the former director of MIT's School of Engineering Practice and a former member of the MIT Commission on Education. He is also a successful businessman and a distinguished public servant who has served as the Deputy Secretary at the Department of Commerce and more recently as the

2.1

2.3

Deputy Secretary at the Treasury Department.

2.1

2.3

As Secretary of Energy, he oversees critical, cutting-edge research. He knows how crucial higher education and innovation will be to our future. His department's research labs have been working with middle and high school teachers to help them inspire students to pursue careers in technology and in science. And I really appreciate his commitment to this commission and his presence here today. Thank you, Sam, for being here and please welcome him.

SECRETARY BODMAN: Thank you, Margaret. When the Secretary asked me to join this commission, or participate in it, I was very eager to do so. Higher education, particularly higher education in mathematics and the physical sciences is something that I have always felt very strongly about. Now as your Secretary of Energy I also have a professional interest.

Americans, of course, are feeling the pinch of higher energy prices these days. We are doing our best to promote conservation and energy efficiency, which is going to be needed near-term as we are preparing for the winter months. But, over the longer term we know that the only solution to our energy problems really will derive from science and

technology.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

The Department of Energy is the thirdlargest funder of basic research in the United States after NIH and the National Science Foundation. We are the largest government sponsor of research in the physical sciences: mathematics, chemistry, and We commit money, not only through our physics. national laboratories, which are some of the finest in the world, but also we commit over a billion dollars directly with grants to Universities, a fact that is not lost on many of my academic friends in the leadership of these institutions.

So, we have a real stake in this. We also have programs to train and encourage future scientists and engineers. We had one that we just wrapped up this past weekend where we've had two weeks of the solar decathlon where we had eighteen universities present including Michigan that had a contest on designing homes for a two person family. designed and built these facilities and were evaluated on ten different criteria. The University of Colorado I was pleased to report won. The others, there was uniform high enthusiasm, both the faculty who were there when I visited yesterday morning as well as the students.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So, it was a great thing and it was something that we work on and that we are very proud of. But it's an example of what we do to try to reach out.

But as proud as we are of what we have accomplished, I'm very worried about maintaining our excellence in scientific work. I am a product of government funding of University research. I went through MIT on a NSF fellowship about two thousand dollars a year, as I remember. That seemed like a great fortune at the time. I was happy to have it, lucky to have it. I taught for a while and then I went into private business about forty years ago.

When Ι started to work the American economy was about a trillion dollars of gross domestic Last year our economy was eleven trillion product. dollars. That increase, Ι amconvinced, importantly those who are gifted in the area economics also believe that a huge part of that ten trillion dollar growth in our economy stems from the investment the government has made and that private industry made for a long time in research, particularly research in the physical sciences.

Corporations are less able to do that today than they were thirty, forty years ago. More and more the responsibility rests here and we're doing

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

our best to try to deal with it, but we do so, I do so with great concern about the situation that confronts us. The National Academy did a report, Chuck I know you were a participant on the group and the report is called, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm - Energizing and Employing America for A Brighter Economic Future."

And it basically speaks to the issues of our deficiencies in the science and engineering areas.

There listed were, in here, some indicators, I won't bother reading the whole thing to you, but there are a few that I thought I would pick For the cost of one chemist or one engineer in out. the United States a company can hire about five chemists in China or eleven engineers in India. are profound differences and they are good. For the the most capable high-energy accelerator on Earth will, beginning in the year 2007, reside outside the United States.

Chemical companies have closed seventy facilities in the United States in 2004 and have tagged forty more for shutdown. Of the one hundred and twenty chemical plants being built around the world with price tags of a billion dollars or more, one is in the United States and fifty are in China.

In the year 2003 only three American

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

companies ranked among the top ten recipients of patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark office. In China, in 2004, China graduated over six hundred thousand engineers, India three hundred and fifty thousand, and America, seventy thousand. Those are some factoids.

We have a real problem and the first step is to try to recognize it. I would encourage the maybe passed commission, you this out already, Margaret, I am not sure, but if you have not I would encourage the commission to take note of it. They did job. They made a number of very good recommendations including several for our department on how to improve science education, research, and investment.

Also is suggested that we have to focus our attention on getting students ready to go to our universities, particularly in the sciences. It is hard work and somehow our kids are not interested. They are not excited. The man who can talk about this is my colleague Ray Orbach who is a university educator himself and a great physicist in his own right. And he talks about the excitement that people feel, that young scientists feel gathering together to work with these facilities that are available and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

trying to convey that sense of excitement to the next generation. We're not doing that very well and we simply must get after it.

Because, at least based on my experience, our economic future depends on it. And I feel it very strongly. We are doing everything we can do at the Energy Department to live up to the job that we have, but I am sort of a one-issue person here on this, so I appreciate Margaret giving me the opportunity to speak to the commission right off. But this whole issue of funding and conveying a sense of excitement and enthusiasm that existed years ago, but we seem to have lost through whatever process.

As I have talked to my classmates, my contemporaries, who are mostly engineers, a few scientists, mostly engineers. Almost all of their children are lawyers. It is a real issue and it is a societal issue. And it is something that, I hope, this commission can focus on and can add to the very good thoughts that have already been set forth by the National Academy. So, I feel passionately about this, I appreciate being here, and I we will do our best to contribute. My colleague, Ray, and I will do our best to contribute to your deliberations. Thanks very much.

2.3

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Secretary I am going to speak from slightly less lofty Bodman. heights so we can create a dialogue and I can see all of us at the face level. Secretary Bodman, we are honored and energized by your personal presence here today. Your experience in academics, government, and in the capital markets is unique and it brings that unique perspective. We hope you will continue to be involved and we will call on you to do And, of course, Dr. Orbach we appreciate your being here and we appreciate your involvement the same Thank you very much. way.

do have three other Secretaries who ex-officio members the have been named as commission, also honored to have their we are involvement officially, Defense, Commerce, and Labor Secretaries.

Secretary Spellings, thank you very much. This is an inspiring beginning for the commission. I am sure that each commission member understands the importance of higher education in the U.S. economy and its role as a gateway to the opportunities all Americans honor and cherish. Madam Secretary, thank you for your leadership and for allowing us to make this contribution to higher education in this country.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

I would like to make a few remarks about a suggested process for the commission. Following that, I would like to ask you to introduce yourselves and make any brief comments you would like to make. And then we can begin the dialogue, the real work of the commission.

A round table discussion here today based on several issues and on the framework document you have received as working document, Secretary Spellings will participate and Secretary Bodman you are, of course, welcome and encouraged. We will break for will lunch and then meet we on legal and administrative issues, finishing by mid-afternoon. That period of time can be used for suggestions and inquiries about the work process and about how we are going to approach this.

The charge for the commission is very broad and very challenging. And we are here because we have accepted the challenge to undertake a national dialogue on the future of higher education in the United States. We are being encouraged to create the elements of a national strategy with regard to U.S. higher education. This does not mean a set of mandates or directives. This is an attempt to bring focus, to set priorities, to allow and encourage

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

policy makers, business, labor, and academia to optimally direct their efforts and resources toward education and innovation in a rapidly changing, highly competitive world.

The ultimate physical work product will be a report to the Secretary by August 1, 2006. This is a very fast track. I told her it felt to me as if I were taking a sip out of a hydrant, fire hydrant, metaphorically, will Ι quess. This require dependence on material and data already available and on the ability of the commission to initiate sound policy ideas, synthesize a complex set of issues, and put all of that into a relatively short report containing policy and strategic recommendations.

Secretary Bodman alluded to a report that came out this week, The Gathering Storm, we already got that on our radar and we intend to look at that. The people that did that work are some of our important leaders. We already, the Secretary has a copy of this, looked at a very significant report put out at the end of last year called Innovate America. It has a set of participants that are — a list of some of our finest leaders in business, academia, and labor and it has some wonderful ideas and a great framework to look at the issues. It has got a summary comment I

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

thought was a very powerful one. Innovate or abdicate, I think we can find quite a bit of this kind of work that will help us be - start from a running start. But it will take a lot to analyze and synthesize that type of work.

I suggest that we begin by dividing our focus into four major issue areas in order to structure the dialogue and the work efforts, direct resources and organize the inputs from a wide variety of sources. The issue areas that have already been mentioned: accessibility, affordability, accountability, and quality - quality referring to quality of teaching and learning and the quality of research or the creation of new knowledge, the two major missions of higher education.

These are very broad issues and we will use them to break our work into specific priorities and actions. For example, in affordability, I ask us to start with that discussion today. We mean not just affordability to a set of college students or one part of the community.

Affordability means looking at the whole cost structure, the whole economic system of financing higher education and analyzing that because different parts of that system have different benefits, pay

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

different costs, they are different prices, and they are different values. We need to distinguish that language and the specifics of that model in order to make any serious contribution to this question. We have got to look at the whole picture of finances.

so we will use a word like affordability as a summary, but affordability means what is the affordability to the community for what we expect from higher education. We have got to identify that and break it down and study it in great detail and that is one of our big projects. Each of those terms has a broader meaning. We will come to those with specific ideas and results, not a broad generic statement which nobody might look at after we finish our report. We are going to try to have some more dynamism than that.

individual may ask commission members to work directly on certain of these issues and that structure could be in the form of task forces rather than committees, the process needs to be fluid and flexible, and inclusive in the sense that when we can we should try to operate as a commission of the whole. One of the advantages of this outstanding group of people is it is not very big by comparison to what could be a much larger set of players. But it is representative, highly informed, highly and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

engaged and I can tell from talking to you, very much want to do something that has a significant meaning in the future.

We will start with no fixed boundaries. Our results will be determined by how the best ideas turn up. We will start a dialogue with each other today and with the Secretaries. Going forward soon, we need to write each other memos, papers, letters, and emails, send other people's good work to be reviewed by the staff, look at consultants and members of the commission to get the thing started. We'll talk a little more today under the legal limits we have about how we would do subsets of meetings and groups going forward, which we should start fairly quickly.

The commission will seek to identify the best work of recent studies, commissions, and reports, which contain high-quality policy ideas and formulations. We will make a compendium and then that will be reviewed and distilled for those ideas and formulations, and then that will be used to build a foundation for the commission's recommendations.

If you - any of you want to focus on one or more of the issues described in this set up, then please do so and let us know. I do not think that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

there will be boundaries for one person, one member of the commission to be in one set or group and I expect the items we have identified overlap or overlay with each other anyway. They are tied together in one-way or the other.

Please recommend materials for reading and for distribution to the commission, expect that to start first thing tomorrow. I have already gotten some good advice, got two recent book authors on the I have already read those books, thank you, Dr. Zemsky, Dr. Vedder. I recommend those to all of the commission members. I am sure you will get them at a discount at publisher's price and I am sure others like that that that there are can immediately identify and find. Feel free to express yourselves publicly about the work of the commission, it would be most helpful to let public communications be coordinated with the commission Chair, myself, or the Executive Director and we will discuss disclosure issues a little later.

Quickly - the meetings we plan to have four additional times between now and May of 2008. The last meeting will be intended to be in retreat format. We will be able to work on the ideas we have generated in order to bring the efforts to the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

commission prior to the final report writing. All of these meetings are open meetings, we will probably web cast them. The meetings will be regionally diverse and will consist primarily of public presentations by invitation and by individuals or panels focused on our outline of issues with a question and answer period discussion format following the presentation.

The staff that you have met today, there is a larger set you will meet over time. The Executive Director of the commission will be Cheryl Oldham, sitting to my left, Assistant Secretary Sally Stroup, to my far left, second from the end. She is the ex-officio member representing the Secretary of Education and there will be other ex-officio members as I have mentioned. Townsend McNitt, where are you Over there, is a consultant Department of Education, highly regarded in this field and serves as liaison with the Secretary. And you will get to know all of these people plus a few more as the core starting staff.

Consultants, we will need to retain consultants for policy development and other purposes. We have identified a few and we will be looking for others. Suggestions will be warmly appreciated. Our hope is to keep these costs at a moderate level by

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

asking for contributions of time and expertise for the commission as much as possible. Our work product, I see the ultimate product and all of these things are still open for more discussion, I see the ultimate product as a relatively short document with actionable conclusions representing the considered opinion of this group with strategic recommendations for the public policy makers and for the academy.

We could probably, we should probably produce a second document which could be attached, which would include a bibliography and documents and papers submitted to the commission providing research and reference material for any future purposes and to document some of our conclusions.

Then, finally consensus building, I do not know how you would define that. I have a vaque feeling of what consensus is, but you all will know it when we get there. We should develop a report with one view through consensus building, in my opinion, without an alternative views section. As much as possible, conclusions or recommendations should be clear and definitive rather than hedged in order to encourage action and build confidence in risk taking. Those are ideas for a consensus-building my conclusion.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

I would like to ask you to introduce yourself, make any brief comments, and I have the pleasure of starting a discussion or dialogue as soon as we go around the table. Dr. Madrid would you start?

Thank you, Dr. Miller and ARTURO MADRID: Secretary Spellings, Secretary Bodman, I'm delighted and honored to be here, my name is Arturo Madrid. am currently a Professor of Humanities at Trinity University, a government official, director of The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, officer and faculty member at as an various universities, large and small, private and public and for a number of years headed First Institute on Policy studies that addressed Latino issues in this country.

And perhaps one of the most interesting important things I did was to run a graduate fellowships program funded by the Ford Foundation that made it possible for us to develop the first cohort of Mexican-American, Native-American, and Puerto Rican academics in the country.

I would say that my principle concerns are and have been for many years to assure that people who make up this nation but who have not been part of institutions in society have access to these

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

1	institutions, all of the institutions, and in this
2	case institutions of higher learning not only as
3	students but also as staff, faculty members, officers,
4	and directors of both of the regions. And so I come
5	to this enterprise with that background and with those
6	continuing concerns made more acute, of course, by the
7	fact that higher education, from my perspective, is
8	becoming a privileged arena and we have to make sure
9	that it is available to all and to ensure that the
10	quality that we pride ourselves in is available for
11	all peoples in a diverse society that we have. So,
12	thank you very much.
13	CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Dr. Madrid.
14	Would you excuse me a moment and let me ask Sara
15	Martinez Tucker, my personal vision is limited so, I
16	didn't
17	SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER: Oh, this is a good
18	seat then.
19	CHAIRMAN MILLER: It is. I should have
20	started all the way to the left. Would you mind?
21	SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER: No problem. I am
22	Sara Martinez Tucker; I have the privilege of
23	supporting the Hispanic Scholarship Fund. We exist to
24	double the rate of Hispanics earning their college

degrees and so we do work in two areas.

Number one,

we try to put more Latinos in the college education pipeline. To support that we have parental engagement general programs, specific programs, awareness workshops, and programming to get kids to graduate from high school college-ready. Last year we put about thirty thousand children plus their parents through our programs as well as provided scholarships to encourage children to start college as soon as they graduate from high school.

Our second big pipeline is getting Latinos who start college to finish with their, at least their baccalaureate degree. We did about twenty million in scholarships, seven thousand across the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands as well as providing alumni mentors to providing chapters children and on campuses to enhance their connection with their institutions of higher education.

I am proud to say that ninety-seven percent of our scholarship recipients are in at least a baccalaureate, forty-three percent go on to graduate school, eighty-eight percent earn the national per capita median income, and eighty percent are active volunteers in their communities. So, we exist to break that cycle of under education in the Latino

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

community and I am excited to be here and to work on these issues so that we can get more Americans participating in higher education.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Would you mind, Dr. Orbach?

RAYMOND ORBACH: Thank you, Mr. Miller. I am privileged to be here and work with Secretary Bodman and Secretary Spellings. I guess I am an exofficio member of the committee. My own background is, as the Secretary generously referred, started with the University of California. I was Chancellor of the University of California Riverside, the most diverse campus of the ten University campuses.

Since the spring of 2002 I have had the privilege of being the Director of the Office of Science within the Department of Energy, which is the largest supporter of the physical sciences in the United States. About a quarter of our budget is spent on University research through grants that are peer-reviewed.

I am delighted that Secretary Spellings has created this commission. Those of you who noticed that the Delphi Corporation has just declared bankruptcy has sent a shockwave through the country. We have seen that already in California, but the blue-

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

collar jobs where people without a college education could support a family and buy a home and have a future are waning.

The Delphi collapse sends a signal for the entire automobile industry that college education is now a critical factor in the future of our country. And so the timing of this commission could not be more appropriate and I thank Secretary Spellings for bringing us together.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Jonathan?

JONATHAN GRAYER: Jonathan Grayer, glad to I am the CEO of Kaplan, which started as a be here. test-preparation company helping all of us get into colleges and graduate schools that we aspired for, hopefully some of you in this room. The company has grown well beyond that mission and today owns seventythousand six colleges where thirty-four students attend. We have twenty-three thousand students online and eighteen hundred at our online law school called Concord Law School, the only online law school in the country. We own schools in - higher ed schools in the UK, Ireland, Singapore, soon to be Australia. diversifying in a global higher ed environment to provide hybrid education under the motivation of learn to earn, that our students are coming to us to upgrade

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

their skill sets to change the trajectory of their professional career. That career training ranges from medical assistance through business, medical, and all the way up through law school. Thanks for including our voice.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Art, would you pull that, good, oh you're reaching for it now.

ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Madam Secretary, Mr. Secretary; it is a privilege for to be here. I am currently the Senior Vice President at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. That has been true since July of this year. Before then I was President of Lafayette College for twelve years, which is a small Liberal Arts college in Pennsylvania with about twenty-five percent of our students being Before engineers. that Ι was, unfortunately, Secretary Bodman, a lawyer here in Washington - not a trial lawyer - and then I served as Deputy Secretary of Transportation under the first President Bush.

I would say that for the U.S. Chamber the subject of work force education and preparation has become an extraordinarily high priority. We have begun to focus on that issue because our members, our chambers, are extremely concerned about the inability to hire workers who can do the job and there is so

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

much being spent on training, and while ostensibly there are many people unemployed and underemployed, there are many jobs going begging because the technical skills are not available.

We are deeply concerned because, as baby boomers begin to retire, that skills gap will become far greater. We think there will be almost six and a half million positions that we will not be able to fill by the year 2010. And it just gets worse as more and more senior people retire. So the Chamber, which has been concerned with this issue in the past, has really moved it very high on our radar screen and I am delighted and, on behalf of the Chamber, to be a participant.

Just looking - one other thing I would identify in terms of my former experience as a college President, I think the one thing we have to keep in mind is the diversity of higher education in this country. We have almost three thousand institutions going from community colleges, and I'm not talking about the online institutions such as our colleagues here, but institutions with physical facilities. They go from small institutions, religious institutions, to, of course, major research universities. And I think that is part of the genius of our system and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

part of what produces such great results, but we have obviously got to reenergize it, refocus it, and really produce the kinds of results that Secretary Spellings spoke about. So, thank you very much for the opportunity to participate.

RICHARD STEPHENS: Good morning, Rick Stevens, I'm with the Boeing Company. I have been in the aerospace industry the last twenty-five years and I am really pleased and honored to be a part of this commission.

For the last - for the bulk of my career I have been involved in running P&L businesses from guidance systems for intercontinental ballistic missiles to submarine combat systems having run our space shuttle business, and most recently before being asked to go run our internal infrastructure, I led our homeland security business and put together a lot of the security that is pouring forth into the airports across this nation. So, I am the culprit for some of your bag screenings that you have go through.

The last role I was asked to take on the HR leadership role within the Boeing Company where we have a hundred and fifty-one thousand employees. Over half those employees have degrees after high school or some form of college education and, for us, it is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

about the mind wear and the mind skills capabilities critical to our long-term capability. As the nation's largest exporter we recognize that having strong minds who have critical thinking capabilities is critical to our long-term success not only as a company but as a nation.

Ι think the role that, from Μy perspective, having been involved in education and looking at the future going forward, I do not think there is an organization, an institution, individual in this nation who is not interested in the focus on education for the future, whether it is at the K-12 level or at the higher education level. thing the challenge we face is: how do alignment and integration of all of our activities?

Because we know there are many resources out there, many activities, just within the Boeing Company we spend about a half a billion dollars a year on education. We spent over a hundred million dollars last year sending our employees back to college. Another four hundred million dollars associated with internal training to make sure that the employees we have are always in a position of learning, unlearning, and relearning the skills as technology and knowledge continue to change.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

And so, while it is critical import from our standpoint, and we look at it from a Boeing standpoint, that the role in this commission is off looking at the future of education, while I come here from a Boeing perspective, I also come here as a citizen of this nation because this is critical to our long-term national defense and national economic survival. So, thanks for the opportunity.

Good morning, I'm Sally SALLY STROUP: Stroup, I am the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education and I am an ex-officio member of the committee. Our office at the department the eighty billion dollars the government makes available in student aid funds every So we are very interested, I think, as the year. Secretary said, in where that money goes, what we are getting for that money, how it is being used, ensuring it is going to the right students at the right institutions. And we also do international programs, oversee accreditation outreach programs; we certainly all the college Presidents here have been involved with in their careers, and those things all fall under the bailiwick of the post-secondary office.

MICHELLE O'NEILL: Thank you and good morning. My name is Michelle O'Neill, I am the acting

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

Under-Secretary for Technology at the Department of Commerce, Secretary Gutierrez asked me to send you his thanks for having the Commerce Department join this committee.

We are very much - one of our primary missions at the Commerce Department is in advancing policies and programs that support the competitiveness of U.S. industry and its workers. We are home to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, so we have a - very much a stake in R&D funding and world-class the attract and retain ability to researchers and scientists. We are also the home to three Nobel Prize winners in physics, most recently Dr. John Hall. Thank you and I look forward to serving with you.

NICHOLAS DONOFRIO: Madam Secretary, Mr. Chairman, colleagues, Ι Secretary, Mr. amNick Donofrio with the IBM Company and it is my pleasure to be here with you and serve with you as well. been at this with the IBM Company for forty-one years. I am part of an industry that has simply been nothing but change over those forty-one years. It is an industry that, probably in some sense, has had a lot to do with the success of the United States of America

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

in terms of its growth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

But we find ourselves at incredible crossroads right now where not only is everything continuing to change but even the process that we use to change is changing at the same time. Madam Secretary I was very encouraged by your use of the innovation, several times in your Innovation is the key and the question on remarks. the table is whether or not we are actually educating our young to be prepared for a world - a globalized world, I might add where innovation is likely to determine who the leaders are in the twenty-first century.

innovation is, is What а terribly important problem. We worry about it every day. IBM I have the fun of being responsible for nearly a hundred and ninety thousand scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians all around the world, more than half of whom are here in this country. yes, Secretary Bodman, I think we are one of those companies that you addressed in your remarks. One of those three American companies that in the top ten for invention in this country. We have been number one for twelve years in a row. However, that by itself is not the answer to success in the twenty-first century.

It is critical, it is important, and Mr. Chairman, I hope as we proceed through our deliberations that we understand just as you had outlined in the beginning, it is going to take a balance, a balance of thought and a balance of energy to come through with a report that is going to do something significant for this country as we look at the future of higher education here.

I like all the comments I heard about diversity. We are a very diverse company. We are diverse because diversity of thought is what makes us go and along with diversity of thought comes the diversity of gender, race, and ethnicity as well. In the end, innovation, globalization, our ability to be multi-disciplined thinkers, these are all likely to be the keys to the future. And it is my fondest hope that this report will help our higher education system get there faster. Thank you for your attention. One small administrative note, if you really want to send me an email. It is not "N" capital; it is "n" in lowercase, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I was going to have a learning experience with this group, so I am technologically disadvantaged, I attribute that to my age, but I am a fast learner.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

LOUIS SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, Secretary Spellings, Secretary Bodman, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to serve with all of you. My background includes the following. I served as Secretary of Health and Human Services during the administration of George H.W. Bush and I am presently serving as Chairman of President George W. Bush's commission Black Colleges and Universities. on Because of the three thousand or so colleges universities, one hundred six are predominantly African-American. They serve a very important purpose in educating a number of young people in our society.

The board of advisors consists individuals from around the country that support us in our efforts to give good advice to President Bush and to Secretary Spellings. I also serve as co-chair of the President's commission on HIV/AIDS. And, as you know, this is a severe issue around the world, more than forty million people infected with this virus. And in parts of the world where it has hit hard, this is causing social instability, economic disaster, and it is predicted to spread into Asia and India over the next decade if changes are not made. And that is related, in part, to the education of those communities.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

I am committed to, as all of you, to higher education. And we, as a country are becoming rapidly more diverse. The demographers predict that by the year 2050 there will no longer be a majority population in our country. We must address this increased diversity that we have as a nation.

Higher education, in my view, is a road to equity for our citizens and as already mention indeed the positions of the future require a much more educated workforce. It is related to economic development, it is related to social advancement, and it is also related to the social cohesiveness that we want our country to have as we go forward, committed to the ideas that have brought our country to where we are today.

It is also related to health status. One of my other roles is working to develop a national health museum here in Washington whose purpose will be to increase the health literacy of our citizens. We, as a nation, are not the healthliest nation on Earth in spite of the fact that we spend more dollars per capita on healthcare than any other country in the world. A lot of that deficit is related to inadequate health literacy of our citizens.

So here again, education is the key to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

2.1

2.3

improving our society. The social transformation through which we are going is very challenging and I want to thank Secretary Spellings and congratulate her on bringing us together to see what we can do, as a nation, to address the challenges that confront us so that we will continue to have the leadership that has indeed characterized our country thus far.

We must adapt to the changes that are underway and I am pleased to be working with all of you as we respond to the challenge given to us.

JAMES DUDERSTADT: Mr. Chairman, Secretary Spellings, Secretary Bodman, I am Jim Duderstadt, I am from Michigan, I believe in miracles, at least this Saturday afternoon. I also know Charles's reputation well and I am confident that this commission will respond well to your charges, Secretary Spellings, on time.

My own background is, trained as a nuclear engineer on an atomic energy commission fellowship, has been University President, and now back in a more natural position of University Professor. I am not going to make remarks with one exception, but I will note that the framing document that Charles convinced, Chuck Vest and I put together for the commission, kind of lays out some of our own views.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

The one comment I would like to make and commend Secretary Spellings for is that if you look back about the same time that President Roosevelt was signing the G.I. Bill in the waning days of the Second World War, he also accepted a report from Vannevar Bush, that created the structure of partnership between the Federal government, higher education, and industry that really created the intellectual capacity of the nation, R&D, trained scientists, engineers, and so forth, and I think was responsible for much of our economic growth in the last half of the twentieth century.

I commend you because you have kind of recreated that partnership and energized it on this commission. And I think that is the partnership that is necessary to understand better what the needs of the nation are from higher education as we try to create economic prosperity, national security/social wellbeing in the face of evermore-competitive global knowledge-driven economy. It is an appropriate constellation of people, constituencies, that has to address that together.

RICHARD VEDDER: My name is Richard Vedder; thank you, Secretary Spelling, Secretary Bodman, and Chairman Miller. I am a lowly college

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

professor, but I do not consider it lowly at all. I think it is the most noble job in the world and although I have written seven or eight books, one of which is somewhat notorious in the academy, which is why I am on the commission, I think, it has gotten me in a little snit with Mr. Ward over here that the press back here has speculated about.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: We are going to build on that.

not sitting next to each other. That, in spite of all this, I think my proudest claim is the fact that I have educated over ten thousand students personally over forty years, and I love it in the classroom. And I am missing two classes today and I hope this meeting is qualitatively good enough to justify missing class, something I have only done three times in forty years.

I suspect I was put on the commission largely because of issues relating to the affordability question. Because I have written a book called, "Going Broke by Degree - Why College Costs Too Much." The affordability issue, in turn, ties closely with issues of accessibility and accountability. And I was particularly delighted by these three, as well as the quality issue, forming the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

basis of the commission. I am delighted to be here, I have quite a few ideas, but I do not think this is the time to expound them.

CHARLENE NUNLEY: Good morning, Secretary Spellings, Secretary Bodman, Chairman Miller, I am Charlene Nunley, president of Montgomery College. I want to make it clear that Montgomery College is a community college and that America's community colleges educate more than half of the undergraduates in the country, so I am very glad to be here with you.

I also want to let you Dr. Duderstadt know that as an alumnus of Penn State a miracle truly is in the eyes of the beholder. I still have not recovered from that game. I have a couple of very, very big concerns, I think. I saw a survey recently that says that about, more than ninety percent of the third graders say that they intend to go to college, that's a wonderful thing. But, I am very troubled by the fact that across the country we are seeing community colleges turn students away from higher education because of lack of space or lack of resources. And if these students cannot be admitted to colleges, where in fact are they able to go that is affordable?

I am very concerned because I think No

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Child Left Behind is working and what I do not want to see is No Child Left Behind Until College. So, the issue of access is very important to me, it is tied up with affordability.

I think our nation's community colleges can play a very significant role with all of that as well as the workforce issues that we have heard about so eloquently from the Chamber of Commerce.

So, I am looking forward to this, I am very honored to be here, and I am very impressed with all of the wonderful people I am getting to know.

ROBERT ZEMSKY: Madam Secretary, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, I am Bob Zemsky and I always point out that to my embarrassment and their chagrin I am frequently mistaken for an economist. Actually, I am trained as a historian. So I really would like to second something that Jim Duderstadt said thought it was fascinating and really important that Secretaries bracketed the two the issue in remarkable way.

Secretary Spellings, you talked about the G.I. Bill. If there is any one piece of Federal Legislation that structured American higher education it was the G.I. Bill. Even more than the Morrill Act, actually, because the G.I. Bill affected all

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

institutions not just public.

2.3

And the other is, as Jim said, is the Vannevar Bush's Science the Endless Frontier. If you have ever read the report it is as cogent today as it was fifty years ago. And in a way it seems to me that the commissions work structure by these two things. We are not getting the science right. It is not just that they want to become lawyers; they do not even want to read about science. And, in a way, we have forgotten all of what the G.I. Bill did in a collective kind of way. So it just looks like a financial aid program.

The G.I. Bill was much more than a financial aid program in the beginning. I grew up in Tucson, Arizona; I can still remember the Quonset huts that they suddenly put up on the U of A campus because the G.I. Bill was flooding that campus with students.

I make just two final observations as we go forward. I have two rules of thumb. One is - more of the same is not going to work. If, in come august we give you more of the same we have failed you. And the second is: we are not going to be able to design the future. This is not like California in the 1960s where you were going to have a master plan and you said so many kids go here and so many kids go there

and all of that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

However we got here no longer matters. We run a market enterprise. They are not pure markets but they work like markets. And they distribute resources like markets. So we are going to have to, as a commission, it seems to me, be one of the first to say can we explicitly use the market to achieve public purpose. And, again the two public purposes are, the investment in science and the investment in access.

DAVID WARD: Madam Secretary, Mr. Secretary, and Chairman Miller, I am delighted to be on the commission. Like my colleague and combatant here, Mr. Vedder, I spent most of life as a lowly professor. But then misfortune afflicted me, I became College Chancellor at University of Wisconsin, Madison and now I represent my former colleagues Advocacy Organization for All of Higher Education in the American Council of Education, which has eighteen hundred members drawn from every niche in the higher education community.

And of course, one of my challenges is to identify the separate interests and then, distill it into a common interest. And I do think that that common interest, the interdependency of these

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

different niche positions in higher education is one of our important tasks.

The genius of our system is its variety, but the limitations of the system is its inability to articulate as well as it probably could if it were more optimally defined and some of the challenges better specified. That is really my challenge as an association head, but also I think this commission recognizes that we are also in unusual times.

My friend, Jim Duderstadt said that he believes in miracles and I think it does take a miracle in a very serious way in that I think we are in a new era. When you try to plan and invent, if you like, a practical, actionable, national agenda in changing times it is, in some senses, much more difficult than in times that appear to be stable.

And I think as we look back over the last century, or look forward on the next quarter century, we are in changing times with an exponent upon them.

The Tom Friedman book in some ways is one example of a call to action based on changes, whether we describe them as globalization, the unfulfilled promise of technology and learning, and above all, the great new social compact about how we will pay for access and affordability that we, in fact, I think,

2.3

have a creative dialogue going.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

of aid What kind is necessary or appropriate? What kind of tuition is appropriate in terms of quality? What kinds of systems of transfer will make access and affordability work? They are a set of questions, which I think are very different than those that existed with the G.I. Bill. We need something that has that vision, but designed for a completely different era.

And perhaps the hardest thing in addition to the fact that we have this sense of limitation about science, technology, and engineering in our human capita resource base is knowledge of history itself, particularly of contemporary history, and a recognition that we are in big change. Our young people need both a sense of technology and science, but a sense of context that comes from the deep understanding of the age in which we live in relation to those of the past and those of an imagined future. And I think that is another of our challenges. Thank you.

EMILY STOVER DEROCCO: Madam Secretary,

Mister Chairman, I am Emily DeRocco the Assistant

Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training and I

must join my colleague Charlene, as a Nittany Lion,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

and tell you Jim, not all miracles in Michigan are good for the nation. It truly was a miracle. It may be rare, to some of you, to have a representative of the Labor Department as an ex-officio member of a commission on higher education, but there are two reasons why we really do need to here.

is First strong belief and our understanding that the key the nation's to competitiveness is an educated and prepared workforce. Some eighty percent of the fastest growing jobs in the nation require post-secondary education. And as fifteen administer a billion dollar we public investment every year in job training, it is critical that we spend those dollars wisely in the postsecondary environment to ensure the level of our educated workforce is consistent with the needs of our economy.

The second reason is that talent regional development is indeed key to development and as a university R&D spins commercialization of product and drives innovation in regional economy, it is incumbent upon us to assure that we understand the skills and competencies that our workforce needs to follow and attract in many lead that innovation and regional economic cases,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

growth for the good of the nation. So I am very privileged to be part of this commission and look forward, really Mr. Chairman, to working on what I believe is the accountability in higher education for an educated and prepared workforce.

ROBERT MENDENHALL: Madam Secretary, Secretary Bodman, Mr. Chairman, I am Bob Mendenhall; I am the President of Western Governors University. My technology-based background is in education and learning and WGU was created by nineteen Western Governors, essentially to use technology to create a new model in higher education that would expand access and lower the cost and maintain or improve quality. We are the only accredited competency-based university in the country, which means simply that we measure learning rather than time. Our students are working adults, average age of thirty nine, most of whom have competencies developed, sometimes at the University often in their life and experiences and work experiences.

I really have three interests in this commission that I hope we can address. The first is, to use technology to change models in higher education to improve quality and expand access and lower cost. Technology has impacted the way we do business and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

greatly improved productivity in this country and yet, has so far impacted very slightly the academy. The second would be to expand and improve our research capability, particularly in science and engineering. And the third is to facilitate new models of higher education that would allow us to address the issues that have been raised Secretary Spellings, by yourself.

We have great diversity in our higher education system, but we are primarily still based around one model that was created a long time ago engrained in both law and tradition, which is that we measure time rather than learning. And I would hope that we could create the opportunity at least for new models of higher education that might fundamentally change the enterprise and improve the productivity of the enterprise.

GERRI ELLIOTT: Madam Secretary, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, I am Gerri Elliott, corporate Vice President for Microsoft and I lead the team of thousands of folks around the world who serve government and educational institutions.

I, like you Madam Secretary, sent a son off to college for the first time this year. And I have a fourteen-year-old daughter as well, and she is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

determined to go to one of the fine institutions in the U.S. But I am very worried about what the world will look like when my son graduates and my daughter enters, and for the following reasons.

There are bright, determined kids that will not have the means to go to college. There are determined kids that not the bright, may have sustainability to graduate. There are bright, determined kids that may not be encouraged or incanted technical fields that enter must spark innovation that we need in this country to stay And those bright, determined kids, competitive. percentage-wise, might not be women in those technical And there are bright, determined kids that, fields. when they do graduate, may not have the skills necessary to compete in a global marketplace. believe that it is going to take a public/private partnership to fix this problem. I love the way that you have articulated and framed the work of commission, but I do think that not only as access of problem but sustainability needs to be addressed with access as well. Certainly affordability, I love that you have quality in there, but under quality there must be relevance and like my friend, Mr. Donofrio said from IBM, it must be innovative as well and there

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

must be a stream of diversity across all of the aspects of the work streams that we do.

My company's mission, stated mission, is to enable people and businesses around the world to realize their fullest potential. And so we are thrilled to be a part of a commission that aspires to do the same. Thanks for the opportunity.

JAMES **HUNT:** Madam Secretary, Mr. Secretary, my friend, Mr. Chairman, my name is Jim I served four terms as Governor of North Carolina but I did it in an unusual way. elected in 1976 and I served two terms, I was the first two-term Governor of the state. I was term limited and went out for eight years and then came back, elected in 1992 and served two more terms. So I have been involved with Governors and leaders around the country for about a quarter of a century.

As Governor, my main concern was jobs for my people, and that is the case with just about every Governor in America. They primarily focus on jobs. As I did that, and as most Governors do that, you quickly realize that the key thing you need to do well is education. Educating your people, developing their minds and their skills, I like to say helping them learn to think for a living.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

One of the things I did as Governor was to establish the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics. Then I worked with Governors all over the country to do the same thing and about seventeen of them did a statewide school.

I also quickly discovered that we needed to focus if we are going to improve education we need to focus on improving teaching. So working with the Carnegie Corporation of New York, I led the efforts to establish the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. And I chaired that board then for ten years.

I now am Chairman of the Board of the Hunt Institute's Education Leadership and Policy. In all those years as Governor I found that Governors did not get a chance to focus on what they could do and how to improve education a lot. Came to Washington a lot and talked about Medicaid. And Medicaid is important, Mr. Secretary. But, the main thing Governors need to focus on is education and developing our people so that we can be competitive in this world.

And so now the Hunt Institute is focusing on that and I am very proud to chair the National Center on Public Policy in Higher Education. I believe very strongly that this country can compete

2.1

2.3

and win. Now our competitiveness is slipping, and I think most of us around this table know that. But we can do it, if we know what we have to do, if we know what the challenge is.

And then if we have a plan, and we are going to be working on one here, and if our leadership asks us to do whatever it takes including down the road making sacrifice. And we need to be asked to make more sacrifices, in my opinion, to the good of the nation. I think that education in this country has to be our absolute top priority, for every reason that you can think of, foreign and domestic.

I am delighted at the progress we have made in lots of ways. When Secretary Spellings was working with Governor Bush in Texas, they made tremendous progress. And they did that Governor Bush gave it leadership, the business community got behind it, the political leadership and the business leadership together pushed forward, and the public said we want change, we want to improve things, we will do whatever it takes. And Charles Miller was right in the thick of all of that. And that happened in Texas.

And we have done some very good things in America; I am one of the strongest supporters of No

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Child Left Behind. Yes, we can do it better. Secretary Spellings is doing a lot of the things we need to do. And we need to fund it better. I also believe we can do higher education better, folks. That little paper that was sent out to us at the end of it said, "Do no harm." Well, we sure don't want to do any harm, but folks; we can do a lot better.

And it is going take business to delighted the Chamber's leadership; I'm with leadership with our business education network. am delighted to see all of you around this table including the great companies of America. But, folks we are going to have to do better, a whole lot better, not a little bit better. This is not an exercise in marginality. We have got to do a lot better if America is going to compete with the new competitors we have in the world. I believe we can do it.

And let me just leave it this way. We have had some references to football here. We all get excited about our teams. My team is going to take a miracle every Saturday to get very far, unfortunately. But, as higher education is where we went to school, we love it; we think about it, we want our children to go there.

Now if higher education really pitches in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

and does the job that can be done to improve children's opportunity, first to prepare them to go, then the opportunity and the affordability, and then the quality of it all, if we can do that in America, those places where we like to go to those Saturday games and watch them on television when we can inspire Americans to do this job of preparing and competing and winning. I believe we can do it and I am excited to be working with all of you and our leaders to make that happen.

next to Governor Hunt that I was hoping that we would go this way and not this way. Just my luck. I am John Molino, I am a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense and I am representing Secretary Rumsfeld this morning in his ex-officio role on the committee. The DOD is interested, of course, in the work of this committee for several reasons, two that I will highlight: research development, and acquisition of technology.

Obviously we are a big customer and we look forward to having folks of great talent work and have careers in the Department of Defense. But we also do not forget that we have thousands of service members who are, every day, taking advantage of the Montgomery G.I. Bill and we want to make sure that we

2.3

give them every opportunity while they are in the service and after their service, so we look forward to our participation.

CHARLES VEST: Secretary Spellings,
Chairman Miller, I am Chuck Vest, mechanical engineer
and the former President of MIT. I have been very
deeply engaged for several years with the Council on
Competitiveness and also the recent work of the
National Academies that several people have referred
to this morning.

have More important, Ι had а approximately a forty year unabashed love affair with American higher education. I was an undergraduate at West Virginia University where I received a fine education and a field of opportunity was opened before I then moved on to the University of Michigan where I stayed for twenty-seven years in that great public institution both as a graduate student and faculty member and ultimately administrator. been a visiting professor at Stanford University on the private side of the house and for fourteen years had the incredible honor of being MIT's President.

With that background, I am sure it is quite clear to you that my fundamental view of American higher education is that we are about

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

creating opportunity. We create opportunity for young men and women; we also create opportunity for a nation, for states, and for regions.

I will, on this Commission, I am emphasize something that several you have mentioned, which is to keep us all thinking about the responsibility breadth of that America's universities have. Not only in its most fundamental mission of educating young men and women, creating human capital, people in knowledge, but also that following the 1945 report of Vannevar Bush, which has been mentioned several times, we are the United States basic research infrastructure and all that for the creation of a vibrant implies economy, security, health, quality of life.

And as the former President of MIT I get to give you a little inside scoop here. The proper pronunciation is "Va-nee-ver" so you can be an insider if you say "Vannevar" Bush.

I believe there are a number of factors that contribute to the excellence of U.S. higher education. Among them, in my view, as others have said is the diversity of kinds of schools we have all over the map. That we have well-developed public and private institutions. That we thrive on a merit-based

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

competition when our system is at its best.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Frankly, a personal belief that we also benefit greatly from the fact that unlike almost every other nation in the world, we really do not have a lot of central planning and Federal control, something I said to the Secretary when she called me to ask, you need to understand my perspective.

And also dependent we are very on Openness to young kids from all different openness. kinds of social and economic strata, race, And openness to international students, culture. faculty, and scholars, something that we must be particularly attuned to in this very difficult post-9/11 era.

On the commission I will, like all of you, be particularly interested in wrestling with the deep issue of access. We must have excellence but we must also have access to that excellence on the part of will in twenty-first what fact be our population. And as Former Secretary Sullivan has so eloquently stated, if we are to have a coherent society going forward, we must have equity across the board.

And let me just close this bit of station identification by saying that, in this age of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

globalization and innovation that of all the enemies the United States faces, the one I fear most is complacency. So I think our job is not be complacent while still recognizing the excellence of our system. Thank you for allowing me to be a part of this dialogue.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Dr. Vest. Secretary, would you like to follow up with any questions? I am going to invite them to toss some your ways and start a dialogue.

SECRETARY SPELLINGS: After you, Charles.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you. If it suits the commission, I would like to open the first of discussion, Ι think learn round as we the personality of the commission we have got some of it with this introduction. We ought to dive in and have a round table discussion on these topics.

I would like to make the first topic the affordability one. As a financial person, I see that as a critical element in the whole dialogue. I think we have some serious margins we are touching today that will change the way higher education is funded.

I have very little optimism that at the state, local, and national level with the demands from entitlement programs and other priorities like public

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

ed or something new that comes in like homeland security that there will be marginal or incremental new money easily available for higher education.

And that especially without examining what we spend today, and look at what I've heard called the dibs and dabs of new programs, which almost never get analyzed or challenged. Asking for new programs or new money would be very hard, very unlikely to achieve much. And in fact would probably not be the best strategy, if you are looking from a strategic standpoint.

So I would like to say, let's think of affordability as looking at the whole financial structure of higher education and address all parts of that, including the things I referred to. I think we have to show we are doing the best with what we have to the public when they feel strained and it is clearly at a marginal point of pressure to the public and we had great framework that listed the cost, the price, and the value, and the return on investment.

Those are terms that we do not use very well, we can define those separately. They do not mean the same thing to all the parties, in fact, value could mean one thing to the student and another thing to the parents, and certainly a third thing to the

2.3

community.

2.0

2.1

2.3

And we need to distinguish those and talk more about them in that language or we will not be able to communicate all the other things we are doing.

I would like to start off just challenging the idea that higher ed system is a market system.

I have heard that and people use the term a lot. That seems to be because there is a competition; there are a lot of vendors or a lot of offers. I don't think that makes a market system, I think there could be competition in a totally undemocratic world and it is not a market system to have a lot of competitors.

For example, high cost of entries for higher education. Infrastructure cost, for example, particularly in the traditional building type higher education institution. Accreditation is a hurdle getting in; licensure is not usually in a free market, an important element.

Funding sources and the form of that funding makes it very hard to enter and staffing, what we need to staff an institution of higher education in a traditional sense is limited.

Pricing, I can't see it, this being a market pricing system. It is complex, it is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

nontransparent, and it is anti-competitive in many aspects of it. At least I think so. I would like to examine that.

It is highly subsidized not always by government, local, state, federal subsidized a lot of higher education, private subsidy also in the form of contributions and all kinds of tax advantages with contributions to endowments and returns of endowments, non-payment of use of infrastructure that colleges and universities get.

So I think the subsidization doesn't mean a market system and then there is a third party payment aspect that, like healthcare, tends to distort almost any kind of value pricing decision which I think is one of the principle problems with higher education.

It is a highly regulated field; at least I think it is for some of you more than others. It is not as highly regulated or determined by government as in other countries like a Federal regulation, but there are forms of it throughout. There is some choice but not really in regard for every student.

There is a supplier that chooses more than the consumer for a lot of universities. The consumer does not choose to get into many places; it is the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

supplier that chooses who the students will be as much as the other way around. And it is hard to imagine somebody in rural Wyoming of being able to go to almost any place.

Any one of those institutions is very hard substantively to get there. And there are all kinds of cross subsidies within the institution that you may or may not find in a market. And, of course tenure does not exactly make a fluid labor market, I would say, and the use of graduate students as part of that tenured system. The staffing system is more like a medieval guild than a market system.

so I think all of these elements put together, even though you have some of the elements, make it really not a market system and that we ought to unravel that and examine that issue. I would like to take the bottom part of the alphabet, I am sure you do not get enough opportunities if your name ends in V, W, or Z, so I would like to start with those three: Dr. Vedder and then Dr. Ward, and Dr. Zemsky. Maybe you could do us a few minutes each and get everybody else revved up if I have not already done it.

RICHARD VEDDER: Well, I am delighted to hear that alphabetic discrimination has been wiped out.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

DAVID WARD: Which one of you wants to 1 2 begin? ROBERT ZEMSKY: I was going actually with 3 me but you can argue that we are trying to eliminate 4 discrimination, Z would be at the ---5 RICHARD VEDDER: Well, Bob you should like 6 7 this because you get to go last. CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, that is what I 8 9 thought was an advantage. I would say V then comes Z. 10 RICHARD VEDDER: Mr. Chairman, I think 11 your remarks are very perceptive. Jim Duderstadt and Chuck Vest in their document raised the issue of rate 12 13 of return in some abstract sense. And a rate of 14 on social investment and higher education return relates the benefits of higher education to the cost. 15 So it is appropriate, as we identify the benefits of 16 17 higher education, and there are many and no one here 18 denies those, to look at the cost and what can we do 19 to contain those costs. Not only to win public 20 support for higher education but to have a better use 2.1 of resources in our country. 22 It seems to me that if you look back to 2.3 1950 or 1960 and you look at cost in the broadest 24 sense of the word we were spending about one percent

of our Gross Domestic Product on higher education,

one, one and a quarter, one and a small fraction.

Today, and there is an interesting question, how do you define spending it on higher education. Chuck Vest made a point to me last night, he says, "Is the Lincoln Labs part of the expenditure or higher education or not."

You could argue the point, I suppose, in two different ways. But if you use the most expansive definition of higher education costs, higher education now costs roughly three percent of our Gross Domestic Product. Now that is far smaller than the fifteen percent that we spent on healthcare and it is even a little less than what we spend on national security broadly defined.

But it is a rising share and an increasing burden on the American public. Why has this happened? In part, of course, it is no matter what public policy had been there would be some increase.

A nation grows wealthy and has economic growth has rising aspirations for higher education, the demand for higher education rises for good and natural reasons, enrollments therefore at colleges rise, and we would expect some growth under any set of circumstances. However, public policies have worked to increase this somewhat.

2.1

2.3

One fact, and let me mention six factors, and I will do this rapid fire speed cause us college professors with tenure will just go on and on and on, we are almost as bad as politicians if not constrained. We probably all have these little red lights that go off after five minutes. I will do this almost in enumerative fashion.

First of all, there has been over the years rising third party payments that have fueled the demand for higher education including the billion dollars that Secretary Spellings's organization hands out. And at the same time there has been much less done to increase the supply of education. So the demand has risen relative to the supply, which has pushed prices up. When prices rise, and quantity rises with it somewhat, we have a greater share of our resources going for this purpose.

A second factor is that most of higher education, and I am pleased to see that Kaplan is here for example, there is a for-profit sector of higher ed, but the not for profit sector dominates the field. And that means, in my judgment and I am actually picking up on what you said Chairman Miller; there is really no true bottom line in higher education. Did Michigan have a good year in 2004? Who knows? In

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

football, we know. We know with incredible precision.

But what about higher ed?

And there is also in public education, of the desire provide institutional because to independence, we have relatively less accountability perhaps than would normally be the case provided with public institutions. And so we do not have a bottom line people manufacture bottom lines because Americans want bottom lines, we love bottom lines that is what our nation is about. That is why U.S. News is so popular in the higher ed field. So they created a bottom line. And what has this bottom line done? Ιt has raised the cost and accelerated the academic arms Now that is not all bad, but it is not all good race. either and it is something we need to address.

A third factor is that there has been a growing amount of cross-subsidization in higher education. What I mean here is, and I am accepting in broad generalization that community colleges certainly do not fit what I am about ready to say to the same extent that the major research universities do, or nor do the liberal arts colleges, but there have been a decline in support of instruction within budgets of major universities as a share of the total budget.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

Part of this is because of rising research but part of it is because of other factors such as administrative cost, elaborate some cases student facilities, you have got to have a climbing you wall today just not an important or are university, increased expenditures on intercollegiate athletics and so forth. And, frankly, some continued cross-subsidization with more and more of resources going for graduate education relative to undergraduate education. This has contributed to the rising price explosion.

Another factor has been price discrimination, charging different amounts to different customers. It would be interesting to see what would happen if the FAFSA form were abolished and tuition levels made illegal to in American universities. I am not proposing this; by the way, there are a few panicked faces in the audience. But I am just suggesting it would have a profound impact. When you go to a Chevy dealer they do not ask you to fill out a form saying how much money did you make last year, what are your assets, oh, are you paying alimony to someone, and when they learn all this tell you what you will pay for someone to go to college.

And price discrimination has always

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

existed, that is scholarship aid, that is the form in which price discrimination takes, has always existed but it has increased enormously. And increasingly has gone on the basis of merit rather than need.

And I commend to everyone recent, last issue of the Atlantic Monthly, there are several fine articles on higher education in the last issue, one by the President of Reed College, by the way. And I urge you to read that issue, I will commend it to the group.

A fifth factor is one that is highly controversial and has made me a pariah amongst some in the academy; there has been some increases of what us economists call rent seeking behavior. As money has dropped out of airplanes from Washington and state capitals or wherever on campuses, some of that money has found its way into the pockets of the staff and others. We have made life better for ourselves in the academy.

Now some of this is the natural consequences of economic growth, we have to keep up; we have to be competitive with nonacademic fields in hiring professors and all. But, and there is a lot of talk about five hundred thousand dollar university hundred thousand dollar presidents and three

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

professors and million dollar football coaches, even million dollar football coaches who lose.

But if you look at things, the life has gotten a lot better for people in the academy. Our teaching loads as professors have fallen. We need to examine what we are doing as people and how we are paying people.

Now the one thing I have not said that my colleagues will be apoplectic about, which I will say, and it has already driven the Secretary from the room, is that it is true that in the last few years there has been a decline in Federal, not Federal support so much as state support, particularly for public universities. It is very significant; it has been going on in some way and more of a stealth way for twenty-five or thirty years.

And the share of, not only of state budget going for our higher ed has fallen, but by any criteria you want to look at, the share of university budgets funded by higher education in the public sector has declined.

This has created not only the tuition explosion of public universities in the last four or five years, added to it some, but it has also created something of a qualitative gap between the public and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

private universities and that is something which may be of interest for the commission to talk about. So, I will stop there.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Dr. Ward?

DAVID WARD: Well, let me say that I think that this is a sketch, if you like, of the recent past in terms of pressures on higher education. Whether I agree completely with the factor analysis that goes into it, I think there is something in common that since, certainly 1960, two developments have transformed the cost structure and the functional structure of higher education.

One of them, of course, is the rise and the expense of international class research, and the other is the massification that is the opening of institutions to a larger percentage of our population.

Both of these, it seems to me, have occurred in a period when the budgets of institutions have then become divided into various categories. And I think this argument about markets is the fact that while we have talked a little bit about cross-subsidies, my experience as a college president is that was actually quite difficult. The state support and tuition went for instruction and much of the Federal support went for research, it was very

2.3

difficult to move them.

2.3

My football coach was paid from revenues; there was not a piece of academic funding in his salary. It was all paid by TV stations and various alumni insuring his salary. So the idea of a cross-subsidy of athletics is not, there is very rarely any cross-subsidy or any faculty - some institutions the subsidy is the other way. In fact, most contracts we got were subsidies to undergraduate tuition fellowships from athletics.

Another area would be the issue of buildings. It was relatively easy for me to raise funds for physical structures, including stadiums I might add. Again, the faculty senate attempted to embarrass me by arguing why could this not go for naming chairs or for student support. The donor had no other interest or any other purpose than the building.

So, one of the problems, actually, is that while cross-subsidies seem to be thought of as being easier, actually, in practice, you actually are dealing with a quintet of revenue flows most of which are not easily transferable.

And so I think that the idea that it is our strategic intent that we undervalue undergraduates

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

so we overvalue buildings is a little bit ingenious in that I am not sure how easily that occurs and in fact it usually, the cross-subsidies occur because college presidents sense a public good in the university, a sense of the whole and redirect funding often to peril of their job. Because, in effect, these changes are not that easy.

The second issue is the issue that really is all part and parcel of building up the infrastructure of the institution, most of it is not trivial building most of it is obviously to build up the science and technology capacity of the campus.

The second issue is, I think, the challenge of tuition and access that we have faced. That is that state support and tuition used to be, among our public institutions, the sum of those two was the bulk of what made the university survive. And as the ratio between those two has changed, I think what has happened is that we have not really had a public policy debate about a shift from a system in which you have a universal entitlement to low tuition, irrespective of income.

Universities which at one time were overwhelmingly, of course, skewed in their income distribution of their students to one in which we have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

driven to what I would describe as moderate tuition, some of it certainly discounted by financial aid, but that is very different. As the middle class of America now face the idea of significant college cost through tuition, which, of course, twenty years ago may not have been there.

That, too, could be thought of as a market pressure where in fact there is a mixed sense, instead of being a public investment in the student going to is split it now between some investment and some public investment. But we have never really had a debate about whether that is desirable; we have never had a debate about what those proportions should be. Is there a private benefit worth one half of tuition? Public benefit one half? Or, is it, in fact; in some cases a hundred percent of the benefit is public benefit.

So we have not really had a debate about the nature of tuition and what tuition is as an investment or whatever. I think it is not a matter of whether I would disagree with my colleague Richard here, but we have never really discussed it about what that balance should be.

So I would just make those two big points, one is that university budgets have become very

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

segmented, they really are not as easy to crosssubsidize, as you would imagine.

In fact the various pools of money are actually quite separate and it is a challenge to indulge in cross-subsidy and in fact every time I tried to do it, that is, build a music department out of the surplus of chemistry, it is a very dangerous thing for university presidents to do. And certainly the issue of the fact that students do demand, and their parents do demand, higher quality facilities as a result of a sort of upward course in our standard of living.

But I do think that the market pressures are in part not a reflection on the whole picture but on the segmentation of revenues where some of them are more intensely market-driven and others are not.

And the second issue is this issue of the cost to the consumer. Where I think we have moved from a model of essentially universal entitlement to low tuition to one in which it is moderate tuition with some discounts based on income and/or merit and we have never really had a debate about how to resolve that.

Overlaying this, however, I do think the third factor is this changed era. That is that I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

think higher education has coped well, in general, perhaps coped well in the U.S. better than in some parts of Europe or Japan with both of these tendencies.

But the rival, obviously, of developing countries specifically India and China as players in international education and new players like Ireland for that matter is changing the scene.

So that while we have got these two challenges of how you create the infrastructure of a research university and of a system, how you deal with massification, how those come together, and then place them in a new, competitive environment which is global.

All of those three things need public debate. And maybe the challenge for us, and why this commission is so important, is that we have not overtly discussed the issues. That we take pot shots from each side but in fact these three problems, creating the capital for the infrastructure, resolving the nature of tuition as a public or private benefit, and the new competitive environment, is to try and in effect to bring a public policy debate about what the parameters of these should be. What should be the investment infrastructure, what should be tuition as a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

public and private good, and what, indeed are the threats to the current state of higher education because of a new international context.

ROBERT ZEMSKY: Charles had warned me in advance the he does not agree with me, so I am sort of startled a little bit, not since I was warned in advance, obviously I'm not startled. But you set it up, Charles, that this is not a free market. And I do not think that anybody argues this is a free market any more than anybody argues that healthcare looks like a free market. You have all the same high-entry barriers, you have all the same accreditation, all of that.

And I do not think anybody, though I would defer to our colleague Dr. Sullivan, I do not think anybody would argue today, seriously, that market economics have not substantially, maybe even overwhelmingly changed the healthcare business. And I think that is sort of the cusp that we are on. And I sort of look at it, when I say is there really market forces here? What would be the real indicator that there were market forces?

I think one is, and I think David and Richard both are getting at it in different ways, is that where once upon a time cost set tuition, now the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

market sets tuition. We have seen and some of what Richard is talking about, as the upward trend of prices is the result of enterprises trying to see where price sensitivity really occurs.

And that you have this long history now, and Richard is right, it is about thirty years this has been going on. And then it was accelerated because the states, in their need, decided, well, let's take a look. Prisoners do not want to pay rent, old people do not want to pay for Medicare, nobody wants more toll roads, about the only thing left was that we can charge and shift that burden from the public to the consumer.

And so, actually it was state policy more than Federal policy that sort of moved us in this Now the other thing that you asked is, do you have a market or not? Well, let's look at the enterprises themselves and that David was starting on suspect that, though Ι David and Ι have some disagreement here.

But, one of the rules in a market, if you are really in a market it is sort of Lee Iacocca time; you either get out in front, get behind, or get out of the way. And the translation to that is that if you are running a market enterprise you really need more

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

revenue, more real revenue every year. That is what makes a market enterprise work and I think all of those at the table will explain that revenue growth is really an important variable to realize.

In over twenty-five years institutions have learned to generate and to spend more time focusing on revenue than on operating cost. And it is only when there is a real crunch that you get back to the operating cost sum. And I think that is also an indicator of where we are in the market.

And then we get all confused when we say, well, what is a market for. And I used the healthcare analogy, but I do not really like the healthcare analogy. I really like the real estate market. You know, I am always sort of struck when I think about real estate. I do not see a national commission trying to figure out how to roll back the price of housing in the Bay Area or Washington D.C. The markets set the price and a lot of people played the game and a lot of people got hurt playing the game.

But the thing that is comparable between a purchase of a house and a purchase, and I use the word purchase quite consciously, of a college education is these are accruing investments. Most people assume they will sell their house for more than they paid for

2.1

2.3

it. It is just one of the things that drive that market.

And most people assume correctly that they will get more direct financial return from the price they paid for their education, including the opportunity cost and including the cost of money than they would get for not doing that.

So, the way to look at this is that this is like a real estate market. A real estate market that has got all kinds of barriers to it, called zoning, and all of that, you just cannot go build any old house. Now, in some - I have been to Houston, Charles, I realize that I am in a little bit of trouble to talk about zoning, but nevertheless.

That we do fence it in, it is more fenced in than the real estate market, and I understand that. But, it is still worked somewhat like that. Great big giant purchases which people make seldom so they do not have a lot of experience, they are not experienced shoppers, there are very few people in the real estate market who are experienced shoppers. But that it is terribly important that they make the right decision. And the market says, and as long as the value accrues, the price will rise.

And I think that is where we are. One

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

last observation, I spend a lot of my time helping
institutions figure out how to do in this world. And
the interesting thing, and I was sort of struck, I do
not think you quite heard David so I am going to
repeat what David said. I cannot take the surplus
from chemistry and give it to art history or music; I
can't remember where you were - music. The
interesting thing about that observation is, thirty
years ago that sentence would not have computed.
Nobody would have had any idea in the world what the
surplus of chemistry was versus the surplus of music.
We are putting in place all over American higher
education, we are putting in place all over the world
as a matter of fact, information systems that are
designed to essentially calculate what is nicely
called the contribution margin of various units across
the universities. And those are bottom lines. But I
have also, a little bit, quarreled with Richard about
to say there is no bottom line. There is, it is
calculable, it is being calculated, and the argument I
always make, and then I will stop here, it is not that
you cannot pretend you do not have the bottom line,
you cannot play the game I do not want to look, you do
have bottom lines. The question is, what are you
spending the bottom line on. And, if Richard says, if

you are spending the bottom line on your own amenities, that is not a rational policy. If you are spending your bottom line on the kind of things that Secretary Bodman was talking about, then that is a rational policy. So we need to be careful and observe Jim Duderstadt's rule, "Do no harm."

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, that is a great start and I am more supportive of that end of the alphabet all the time. Governor Hunt, though, from the middle?

JAMES HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that we would begin; I do hope that we would begin this work by looking at what the nation's needs are in higher education, and then go to how we meet those needs. And obviously that is going to involve what the institutions need.

As we get into it, it seems to me, one of the first things - we have heard some of this already today but one of the first things we ought to do is to look at and to establish for the country, because we are sort of doing this for America, what is happening with education pipeline. And folks we have a hemorrhaging in the education pipeline. I hope everybody around this table knows it. But let me give you the figures.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

Of a hundred students that start the ninth grade, sixty-eight of them graduate four years later, only sixty-eight, it has gone down recently, not up. Forty of those students, of those sixty-eight, forty immediately enter higher education. Only twenty-seven of them are still enrolled for the second year. And only eighteen graduate three years later for an associate degree or six years later, within six years, for a bachelor's degree, now folks that will not do, in my opinion.

I do not think that we can compete in this new role that Friedman talks about and so many others do, with those kinds of results. I think we must do better and I think we can do better. As we look at what the nation's needs are and what is going on, the figures that Ι know about, that Ι think trustworthy, show that college has actually become less affordable for most American families. Tuition has increased at a rate that is faster than the income of the average American family.

I think we need to be aware as we do this study, this work that we know too little about the outcomes of higher education. And we know we have got great universities and it is probably the greatest thing about America.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

But, how are we doing with outcomes? We worked so hard on K-12 and we have still got a long way to go. We measured how we were doing and you cannot do it the same way in higher education. But there are some appropriate ways to do it and we have begun to develop some of those. But we need to know more about student learning and we need to increase student learning.

And then policy makers and students and families really do not have enough data for making decisions. We have already heard some discussion about what families need to know and perhaps do not have all that they need to know. I can tell you that policy makers do not have enough information about even how many students are enrolled and what is happening with students of lower income families.

A lot of our Federal data collected this fall will not be published for two more years. So we have that kind of lag time, on some things you have got a lag time of ten years.

But there is a lot of data, and we are collecting some good data. But we need a lot more, it needs to be done in a more timely way, a lot of this is going to have to be done by the Federal Government, these are not huge cost items I might hasten to add.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

2.1

2.3

It is just a matter of getting this data and making it available to policy makers.

So, Mr. Chairman I would just want to say that as we start into this, I would really hope that our first order of business, in a sense, would be to say, "what are America's needs in higher education, what does the country need." And then move on into a lot of other things including many of the things we have just been hearing about.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Governor. And we will address that, I think, some of the breakdown we have obviously answers your questions about accountability and I heard the Secretary announce in your home state of North Carolina that every student in America who worked hard or studied hard would have available higher education opportunity no matter what the income of that child was.

I thought that was a pretty important statement of the nation's needs. We can get more complicated and then the creation of new knowledge, which is the research side and the quality of teaching and learning, beyond that I am not sure how we can identify it, some objectives, but we will be open to look at that.

For me that one statement was a very

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

important objective and that is where accessibility comes in, that is what we mean that, how do we get every child into a position to have the opportunity to have a post-secondary education regardless of the financial capacity of that child.

So that would be one of the statements of the national goal. I think most of us here feel and believe that, maybe we should say it more clearly. I am going to recognize one person to my left and then you are next, thank you.

SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER: And that is a great segue way. As I listen to your conversation on free market and cost implications, the turnaround then is price to the student. And if you look at the students that I support and then how they fit with the rest of the country, I could not help but reflect as you were talking about state's prisoners not paying rent and the elderly not paying for medical care. When I was at AT&T, whether it was consumer markets or business customers that I served, I did not have a lot of price flexibility. Because if they did not like my price, they would go to the competition.

Our kids that are low income do not have a lot of options. A lot of our children do start at community college. Ultimately, though, they need to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

be able to afford a higher education to be able to thrive in this country. And so while our costs and all these little factors that you described. We do not really have that free market for our students because they have no choice.

Now there is a solution today. If you are low income today you can get your Pell, you can get your institutional loans, you can get your work-study, you can get scholarships, and you can get loans. And so, you have got an artificial system that is propping up the ability of our children to be able to meet the cost pressures. Unfortunately, I see three serious implications from having this temporary band-aid.

Number one is, we are putting money management responsibilities probably into the least able to be able to do that. The families cannot support it so our students are the ones that become the money managers piecing this together, trying to make it work, semester by semester. And so a lot of the new components that we are seeing reauthorization, I think are important for us to focus on.

The second one, and this is probably a little more controversial, is that if you look at those components that I just identified, we understand

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

that pressures on Pell, and we also understand that sometimes the thinking is that if you increase Pell it may not go to the student. But, regardless there are pressures there.

We have heard described the pressures on the state aid to the student. We understand what is happening with the privatization of scholarships and need versus merit based, frankly the only segment of that equation that is able to make money off of this and grow and invest to meet the students' needs are the loan segment. And I think we have got understand what this loan business is doing students, what it is doing to families, and making sure that we do not have this temporary fix that we have got going right now, have the wrong people leading the discussion around what is happening with the price and the cost in higher education.

And then the last piece of it is, if we do not solve for the cost side at some point the price becomes prohibitive to too many children in this country and we have got to be able to solve it here, with this generation. Because if we do not have more of this generation, the parents have a college education and the right income, then it only creates a higher cost for the next generation of students.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Could you step up to the mic? Thank you.

CHARLENE NUNLEY: I think the goal that described of everybody being able to access higher education and not being prevented because of cost is a very good one. I would like to also add some, perhaps bolder goals.

It seems to me that when we look at our history we had this perspective that we needed to have universal access to public education. And at a point in time that probably meant grade eight. Then, I think we shifted our focus to; we want everybody to at least have the opportunity for a high school degree.

With what is coming to our nation in the way of technology and higher needs for education, perhaps we need to have some kind of a national goal that shifts that up even higher. Not just access to higher education but setting goals of actually achieving degrees, an associate degree or а baccalaureate degree.

Access will not be enough for the future, given the data that Governor Hunt was describing of how the people fall out of the pipeline. I think we have to have goals for completion that will assure that we are educating people to higher levels. So, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

do believe that some focus on, what are the national perspectives, national goals that we are going to achieve with this commission, helps us to wrestle better with the affordability issue.

And then I would also say that being a community college president where we have lower tuition, still I know that at my institution there were over twenty-five hundred students who applied for scholarships that we were not able to award and did not come to college.

Now those are people that we are losing from the educational pipeline. And that is a tragedy, and we have to figure out why that is happening, what we can do to change the price even in our community colleges affordable, and what we can do to make sure that we have the kind of aid systems in place that can help those students to be able to go to college.

JONATHAN GRAYER: The affordability question, as it is presented to this commission, it seems to me should encompass the fact that, what keeps prices down in the long run in any market is not really competition but rather productivity gains. That markets that beat themselves up over price ultimately do not go to a good place. But markets that find better ways to use their resources ultimately are able

2.3

to get to deliver their product more cost effectively in the long run.

And I would ask the group, from the forprofit sector, these metrics for productivity are much But, in higher education how do you define productivity? How can you measure the gains of an institution against a more efficient use of There is no metric that I am aware of that resources. And if this commission could take we can point to. that up, be able to offer to all the different types of institutions that are struggling to meet the needs of their students to what the Governor raised, that would be a pretty dramatic statement, that this is how productivity and higher ed should be measured in this is an idea about how productivity This country. Because if institutions are - and should be measured. what I mean by productivity is using the same amount of resources to do more, and the more part is the hard thing to define. When we talk about our higher education system is great, are we talking about its research product, are we talking about its outcome of its students, are we talking about the cost effectiveness, are we talking about the ability to meet all the needs of our disparate population.

If we are able to define that in a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

coherent way, and then look at, to the point of data, how institutions in the long run can measure against it, I think we will have achieved an economic rent that will provide more room for true gain against international competition.

Rick and then Nick, I will add that the accountability section is intended to do that. We wrestled with the use of the term accountability, talked about productivity, and other measures. But it is a rate to measure outcomes of the system and to follow up on that that would be one of the intents, whether it is a competitive or market or not, so Rick, you would be next.

RICHARD STEPHENS: Yes, thanks Mr. Chairman. I think one of the challenges I think we, as a commission face is data that we can all look at. Whether it is "In God We Trust" all others bring data, or the data shall set you free, whether the information the Governor is talking about or any of the others, I think we are challenged by having a common language to discuss.

If we look at the number of students, and I know the university I went to I would not be accepted today based up on my SAT score when I went

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

there some thirty years ago because the SAT scores continued to rise at one point. Of course college tuition went up nearly a hundred percent at the time I was going to school. But the same challenge we have, the number of students who are completing high school being eligible to go on to post-secondary education is going down significantly just because they are not completing.

So, I think we have this bifurcation of data going on, whether it is tuition, whether it is completions, whether it is graduation rates, and I think one of the things that the commission ought to take on is, what are some of the appropriate metrics and then prior to our next meeting, if we could gather some of that data, then we will be able to get this common language we are talking about.

And then when we look at whether it is the economics, whether we look at the accessibility, we will have a common frame of reference to work for and coming from industry I would be happy to participate on some of those metrics.

JONATHAN GRAYER: I just wanted to note that it is not too late to raise your SAT score.

NICHOLAS DONOFRIO: So, Rick, it is all grade inflation anyway, you would be accepted. So,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

2.3

Mr. Chairman, just a simple thought as we talk about this and deliberate on it. As a global company, I do hope that we take a measure of our competitiveness or our efficiency or our productivity on a global scale. And not just a U.S. scale.

We have here alternatives; we do not necessarily like all the alternatives that we have. We want to see America continue to be great and lead in the twenty first century, but we are naïve to think that they are not doing something better somewhere else in the world. Often times I am reminded, many times, the underserved shall lead. That may be a lesson for us to learn here.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Just define that a little more, are you thinking about competitively, competitiveness generally or in the educational side primarily or --

NICHOLAS DONOFRIO: Clearly in this area of education, we know what they are capable of in our industry.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. I wanted to be clear and I thank you. I know - I don't want to speak for the Secretary, I know that has been high on her list of questions to ask. We are the greatest, is what we hear, I am the greatest, we are the greatest,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

how do we really know what? And, so that is the question we are going to try to get into. I think I had --

CHARLES VEST: I wanted to say a quick word about data that happens to fit in directly to what Rick said. I was emailing back and forth with my friend Bill Bowen last night, who, as most of you know, is the former President of Princeton, currently President of the Mellon Foundation. They have maintained for many years one of the largest databases having to do with higher education. It is called the College and Beyond Database.

It looks at, admittedly, a very select subset of private and public universities. It was the base on which "The Shape of the River" was written, and more importantly, a much more recent book called "Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education."

Their goal, quoting from a memo that I had from Bill, is to extend their work focused on the question of whether American higher education, public and private, is educating enough talented young people from modest circumstances, that is low social/economic status backgrounds as defined by both family income and parental education.

The reason I bring this up, we have all

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

talked about the importance of data, and believe me,
these are complicated things. They are hoping to sign
on a much larger number of universities starting with
the promise of productivity, namely things are
available electronically now that were done by hand
when they started the database a decade or so ago.
And the goal is to extend this equity and excellence
study. And one of the things I find most interesting
in their goals are they are trying to find a more
sophisticated way of defining outcomes than just
simply looking at graduation rates and pure numbers.
And if you have a chance to look at the book, which,
by the way, he said he would be glad to make available
to the commissioners, what they have tried to do is
look at some somewhat subtle effects on career
choices, fields of study, all these kinds of things
that tend to be biased against the kids from lower
socio-economic statuses in very subtle ways. So, I
just want to call this to your attention. Those of
you who represent universities, if you are contacted I
hope you will encourage your university to
participate. It is a swath of higher education, but
it will be a swath that educates a very large number
of young men and women.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. I have got

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

two more, Dr. Mendenhall and then --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ROBERT MENDENHALL: I think as we talk about affordability, the general discussion tends to the institutional revolve around costs at an institution or the student cost and what the real cost is to a student, or how we pay for it in additional aid. What we do not talk about in education very often is about brand new models that could increase productivity and fundamentally change the cost equation.

I mentioned earlier about, I think we have had huge productivity gains in the last ten or twenty through implementing technology throughout industry and society. But it has barely touched education and certainly has not created any productivity enhancements in education. I think we could look at creating, whether it is a marketoriented system today or not, creating a more market oriented system, exploring something as radical as states giving dollars to students rather institutions, same amount of dollars, but let students use those to choose institutions where they will be served.

I think we need to distinguish between research institutions and teaching institutions. They

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

have different missions, different needs, and should have very different cost structures. But, sometimes with every teaching institution trying to be a research institution they, the costs are confused.

We also have very different needs between the 18-24 year old population, which needs residences and buildings and football teams and social activities and are worse than adults, where frankly, those things often get in the way and certainly add unnecessary costs and the working adults are now more than half of our student population in higher education.

Finally, I was really interested in an earlier comment that one of the issues with cost is simply that we have been able to increase demand for higher education without a commensurate increase in supply. And I think one of our challenges would be to reduce the barriers to entry so that supply could be increased. And earlier I think Mr. Chairman you mentioned a number of those barriers to entry, but certainly accreditation and licensing and subsidies.

It is interesting to me that most new institutions in the last twenty years have been forprofit institutions simply because of the cost of entering that is the only way to acquire enough capital to get into the business. I think, finally,

2.3

market economics have changed the healthcare industry.

It is not clear to me that it has really changed education and maybe that is the best evidence of whether it is subject to market economics or not, is whether it is causing fundamental changes in the way we deliver education.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. I want to come back and respond to one of those comments in a moment. Dr. Orbach?

RAYMOND ORBACH: I would like to pick up on a comment that President Tucker made about the complexity of the cost structure to a student who is looking at the university. If you look at the opportunities that the student has for support, it is mixture of Federal support, state support, scholarship support, family support, and loan support. And I think it is quite bewildering, even to parents I suspect. And one of the things this commission might think about doing is to create a template that would enable parents and students to be able to make use of the resources that are there.

Right now many of them are not aware of it, but what is more important is how the student actually manages their financial future. Loans are the swing factor that makes up the gap; there are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

limits on what students ought to get into.

2.1

2.3

And I think having a template for the average student or perhaps a student on the basis of family income, that would enable them to figure out what a balance of opportunities there are and what a balance that makes economic sense would be, would be a great contribution if this commission could do it.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Any other comments on that, we expanded affordability, got into access and accountability. We did not directly touch quality although we alluded to it. So we really did have those four issues. Let me ask Jim --

JAMES DUDERSTADT: Not to wrap up, but just to kind of insert. Let me say at the outset that I strongly agree with Governor Hunt. That I think one of the most important roles of this group is to really consider what the nation seeks, needs, wants from higher education. And that suggests that while opportunity for educating our population is important, R&D is important, we can also broaden it out to look at kind of the Jeffersonian themes of preserving and transmitting our culture of challenging our norms and beliefs, preparing citizenry for a democratic society, new things.

Most of our tertiary healthcare in this

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

country is provided by universities, innovation, and entrepreneurial activity, creating a new industry that will destroy the old in a Shumpter kind of way, keeping up with the exponential increase in knowledge, which is transforming on a continuous basis many of the professions.

I mean our engineering schools now face the dilemma that much of what students learn in the engineering curriculum will be obsolete by the time they graduate. So that demands new styles of education that are truly life-long in character. And the reason I put out those broader roles is because it could be that this strange and misunderstood relationship between cost of higher education to broader society, price that is felt by students and parents, and value that, of course accrues both to society and to students themselves.

That relationship may be changing so fast that in our discussions we are trying to fix something that is beyond repair. We may not have a structure right now that is capable of meeting the broader needs of the nation, financing it.

So as we grapple with these things I think we have to think much more innovatively of what that is - I mean, United States is unusual because we have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

ĺ	109
1	such a large engagement of the private sectors
2	supporting higher education. Some estimate it is
3	almost as much as two-thirds of the support compared
4	to less than ten percent of most other countries.
5	But, we do, essentially depend on one
6	generation in one form or another to support the next
7	generation. And new paradigms might suggest that even
8	that is the wrong way to do it. I mean, Peter Drucker
9	has been proposing for years something more akin to
10	the social security system where people kind of pay
11	their own way through but over their lifetime because
12	they have lifetime educational needs.
13	So I come back again and say how important
14	it is to look at the broad range of roles of higher
15	education. Do not slice it up and look at the
16	productivity or efficiency in a more narrow range
17	because you may throw out the baby with the bathwater.
18	And also do not accept the status quo as
19	what we want to create marginal improvements on
20	because that may be inconsistent with the kind of
21	paradigms that we are going to face in the future.
22	CHAIRMAN MILLER: One more and then -
23	yeah, thank you.

think

Ι

the

ARTHUR ROTHKOPF:

Ι

and

important,

24

25

has

think it is quite

conversation

demonstrated it, but I think it is very important that we perhaps differentiate among the goals here. I think we have got a lot of things we have talked about. I mean, we want to have leadership in science and engineering and I think that requires the kind of research institution where the goals may be different and the costs may be different.

On the other hand, we are talking as well about perhaps more entry-level situations. And I really think that as we talk about affordability there are just vast differences here. And I do not think that there is a single model and I think we have to be somewhat more careful in differentiating as between the two and maybe three or four models that are out Because affordability, it gets complicated if there. you are talking about affordability to a community college which is providing critical needs for these students that is a very different thing from talking about going to one of our major research universities. And I think we really have to look at different cost models there because, I think they, in many ways are very different.

And I think on the cost-side element, there are things we have not talked about. But the government is doing its share at driving up costs.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

There are some very significant Federal mandates and state mandates that institutions have to deal with. Unfortunately, at least my own experience has been, that information technology whereas in the private sector you get more productivity, my experience is that you do not get more productivity in the education institutions. It just simply adds costs; one on top of the other and that has been a tremendous costdriver.

And, finally, I'll throw out probably an with the public unpopular view at large. Intercollegiate athletics, except for a handful of institutions is one of the great money pits for schools and Ι think it would be well for many institutions talk about deemphasizing to intercollegiate athletics even though it is a very nice thing for people, for Michigan, and Penn State, and Oklahoma, and Miami, but for those of us--

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I am not going to recognize any more athletic discussion during this commission's meeting.

ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: What I'm saying is, I think it is a cost-driver that adds tremendous added costs which --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, it does. Let's

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

put that in the amenities department and say we are not an amenities commission, but that is a cost-driver that we will look at in a model of our education. But that is an accurate statement. But, we could not deal with that here and do anything in that nine months. Then - here, one more --

RICHARD VEDDER: Yes, Chairman Miller, this actually maybe is directed to Secretary Spellings And picking up on Jim Duderstadt's in a sense. comment that we need to think broadly and beyond the current models and so forth, just let me read a real quick quote from the new book by Jay Greene on education myths. "The main barrier preventing more minorities from entering college is not money or race, but the shoddy K-12 education many of them receive. Any attempt to address the problem of minority enrollment in higher education that does improved K-12 education will be not focus on ineffective." Now I am not saying that quote is right wrong, but when we deal with the issue accessibility, obviously we cannot take on the world. And you have a whole department dealing with K-12 But, that is a concern and in the documents that came out to us there was some mention of the integration of K-12 in the college and how can we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

integrate them better and so forth. I want to know, is this really part of the mission of the commission?

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I want to say it is a limited part, although the high preparation and especially the fact that the administration has put some strong proposals into the public view and some of our major corporate leaders have identified that as a major gap in preparation for higher education, the articulation issue all the way up and down the line from high school to what kids are taught/learn, that is part of it.

But, I would hope, and I think it is very important to say this, that we do not gravitate to beginning to fix the K-12 system here. We are here to look at the higher ed system. And if where it goes back and we need that for the access we should do it. Otherwise, I think we will be dragged into a full-scale discussion and debate. There was a tendency of that in a couple of meetings we had and I think we just want to be cautious about it. The high school part of it, I think is very pertinent, the community colleges, and the articulation issues are a very important part of accessibility. I think they need to be there.

JAMES HUNT: Mr. Chairman may I suggest

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

this. I would hope that we would say something about preparation. For example, I would hope that we would see fit to endorse a twelfth-grade NAPE so that we know where students are when they start this college. If we are going to measure how well they are learning in college. So, I just --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I totally agree with Alignment of what is taught in high school or that. in community college with the whole system would be a big part of it. We are not aligned in any state in the country that I know of. Although, some are beginning to do that. There is not a single place in America where we line up what is necessary to get into college or most colleges and what we are asking kids to have when they graduate from high school. So it is not there, I just want to be careful that we do not get so far into that side. We are going to look at that, we have to on accessibility and preparation.

We need to look at ourselves if we are saying we are higher education. That is the point. I mean, I think if we do not do that and start looking at the other side it is going to be an excuse to not look at the hard things we need to look at. That is really what the problem would be. Because that is a big set of issues being dealt with. What we do with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

our colleges of education that would be appropriate, that might be the kind of thing. But, I think where the line is drawn needs to be - we need to be careful, I believe.

LOUIS SULLIVAN: Yes, I would like to say that certainly for low income individuals and minorities, the whole issue of financing education is very important. I certainly would agree with Mr. Vedder's comments that K-12 of the educational system has a lot of problems that minorities suffer from.

But, having led a medical school for some twenty-five years, a minority school, that we are concerned for having more diversity in the health professions. One of the great challenges that has existed and continues to exist is the financing of the health profession's education.

We have done part of this experiment as a nation. In the early 1970s, funding for health profession's education was primarily Federal dollars. The Secretary of Health Education and Welfare at that time changed that and shifted to loans as a primary funding mechanism for a health profession's education.

As a result of that today, our graduates of health profession schools leave their medical, dental, or other schools with debts of a hundred to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

two hundred thousand dollars. That indebtedness does shift the career choices of those individuals. We also have seen the shift in the family income of those who are entering health profession schools. They are much more affluent today than they were thirty years or forty years ago.

So, I just want to be sure that whatever we recommend are policies that do not close out higher education to individuals from low income and minority backgrounds. We have a lot of problems here to address, and clearly access to education has been key. We have to be sure that that continues, that must widen.

We have to look at this question not simply from the standpoint of the individual, this is a societal investment. We need to have a system that welcomes and supports individuals because we, as a society, will benefit from those individuals contributing much more effectively to our society. So, we have to look far beyond market forces as a primary determination for our decisions here.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. I think we will cover, or we should cover that in that broad accessibility issue. Every child, or every student that does the work would be a simple way to say it, to

2.3

repeat the Secretary's words, could have access to higher education, broadly defined, no matter what the ability to pay. You were going to say something?

SECRETARY SPELLINGS: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to react to your comments about this articulation question. I would hope that the group would affirm the need to address issues in pipeline, maybe stipulate that, focus on the areas of articulation between the two systems.

But one of the things that I am being confronted with a lot is how is this work, the body of work that God willing will come from you all, different from things that have gone on in the past?

And I think there are two ways that it is different. One, it is convened by me and the Federal government with broad and active participation from around the government with my friends at the Department of Energy, Commerce, Defense, and other places. And the forum makes it a little different.

The second thing I would hope is that many of these other external products really have talked more about the pipeline than about this need for reflection within the higher education system or system of systems as sometimes I call it. And so I would hope that the vast majority of your work would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

focus on that as well as the articulation piece and maybe just stipulate some of the preparedness issues that we are confronting. So, within the administration already, and I think that Governors are working hard all around the country.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, that clarifies and focuses that much better for us and I think that we got that message. It is hard to stay put and focus on that because we are also concerned about the other parts of it. I think we are close to breaking for lunch. One of our major goals that would be a information session, the commission is allowed to meet and talk separately but not to have a formal followed series legal meeting, by а of more administrative and legal sessions where we are going to get briefed by counsel at the very end of our program.

I have to thank everybody for participating the way we did today. I think this is exactly what we wanted. We learned the sense of some of the people, it will help us organize. We heard suggestions loud and clear, we have written them down.

When this session is over and you have gone back to wherever you are headed back today or tomorrow, it would be urgent for you to begin to give

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

us ideas about how to proceed.

2.1

2.3

Like Governor Hunt talked about some big picture ideas, specific approaches. I see us breaking down into task forces on those four items and they are very broadly overlapped.

I see us having small sets of meetings or meetings through telephonic or other methods and beginning to talk to each other and that is perfectly appropriate. Work product we can expand can be just used among the commission members. And I think I see us writing things fairly quickly that could be parts of the report because as soon as we do that, we will begin to shed some things and add some things. It is an interactive process, I think, with this kind of group. And at the beginning it may not seem as organized as we could. I think the more organization we put in there, the more boundaries we set for ourselves, and the more limit we will have for ideas.

I want to personally say that I feel strongly on this financial side that we have come to a point in this country where local, state, and Federal dollars are going to be limited because of other needs, entitlements, budget pressures, tax limitations, whatever that is. And global competition is going to require what we need to do in higher

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

education and what we need to do for the good of the county.

So, it is correct to say the private sector puts a large amount of capital into this area, and wouldn't it be appropriate to find a way, when we talk about things we talk about, that the private sector, if it is such a great investment for the student and the community, could be brought into this with more capital to invest. We do not have to tax people or look for donations to fund higher education.

What we have that is just as competitive internationally as higher education has been, what is clearly the best thing in the world that we have, competitively, is the capital markets. We do that better than all the rest of the world put together. So, what about the idea of matching those two things where we find ways for the private sector to be active, positive investors and not to take away the independence or freedom of the academy, but certainly to encourage that with policies and ideas.

Why should we try to do that? I would like to leave that impression with you all and we will see you after lunch in the official meeting. Thank you very much. Stay on time.

(Whereupon, the above-referenced matter

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

went off the record at 12:11 p.m. and resumed at 1:36 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I would like to call the meeting to order. Thank you. We have two more items on the agenda. At the end of those two items I am going to adjourn and ask the commissioners and invited staff to stay for a legal briefing, which shouldn't take too long.

Cheryl Oldham.

CHERYL OLDHAM: Okay, I will try and be brief here, but I wanted to take a little bit of time to introduce myself to those of you I have not met yet. And then to introduce you to the staff of the commission.

As Charles said, I am Cheryl Oldham. I have been with the Department now for about three years, prior to that the White House, and have known Secretary Spellings for about ten years, which is part of the reason why I am here. I told Dr.'s Duderstadt and Vest the other day - yesterday, I guess, that I took a day off with my two year old son and came back the next day and found out this is my new job. So, that's my lesson learned about taking the day off.

No, actually I am honored to have this opportunity to be here with all of you all. And, a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

little background on me, I graduated from TCU, Texas Christian in Fort Worth. Got my law degree from St. Mary's University, got involved in politics and came to D.C. about ten years ago. So, the time flies.

There is a couple - I should say before I start, there are a couple documents on your, at your place now. One is the Secretary's speech that she gave this morning and the other is the executive summary of the report that Secretary Bodman referenced, "The Gathering Storm," I probably do not have the title right.

The report is quite large, Dr. Vest has it. And so we will, I think we will get each of you one of those, but just so you have the executive summary. And her speech, I thought was important for you to have written as she asked you all to look at some very specific issues. So, maybe a little plane ride information for you to read.

What I want to do, and be brief and introduce the higher ed commission staff to you because, hopefully, these folks you will call on all the time. Vickie Schray. Vickie is sitting over there by the wall there. Vickie has been an educator and administrator at the secondary and post-secondary level. She has led education improvement efforts at

2.3

the local, state, and national level, has worked on numerous commissions involving private and public sectors, and prior to the commission before we stole her away, she was working for the Executive Secretariat of the Department of Education in the Office of the Secretary. So we are thrilled to have Vickie be a part.

Eleanor Schiff. Eleanor was definitely a steal that the Secretary allowed us to take her is kind of a miracle. She has been the right hand to Secretary Spellings for about four years now, so when the Secretary agreed to let her go it was only under the, sort of direction, that she be doing something important. So, this is it. She is a graduate of Carleton University pursuing her Masters in Business at GW. As I said, spent four years with the Secretary prior to that with some legislative experience at HHS and with Senator Frist, she's from Tennessee, so she is excited about our next meeting in Nashville.

Kristen Vetri is a graduate from James Madison University in Virginia, worked for a delegate there and has some extensive campaign experience with both Governor Bush and President Bush and was formerly the Deputy Chief of Staff at the Office of Post-Secondary Education and so we thank Sally for giving

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

her to us.

2.1

2.3

Our mission from a staff perspective is really just to make this as painless a process for you, if possible. So, however we can be helpful and useful to you, I hope that you will call on us. Feel free to call me at any time for any thing. And if you cannot get me, any of the staff are there to provide support and to help in this effort.

We are here to serve you, you are experts, we want to contribute in any way that we can to a report that has a huge impact, but we recognize that you guys are the ones that are the experts and we are just going to make this, hopefully, an easy process for you.

Just a couple little things about the staff, actually, on sort of their duties. Vicky is, as we speak, formulating a strategic plan, sort of how do we get to August 1 from here, make sure we meet all our major milestones, fulfill the commission's goals, working with the experts and consultants, the many that we will gather to help us with this and working on some budget things for us.

And Eleanor is going to be the one that looks and reviews and compiles all of these great works that are already out there and what we can use

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and the relevant research publications that we will use to sort of make a start at our report here.

And then also work a lot, we have obviously numerous, numerous external organizations that are very interested in be a part of this and helping in some way or another and I think it is important to at least figure how out we can utilize all of those folks. So, Eleanor will help with that.

And Kristen is sort of, as you all know have received lots of communication and contact with Kristen and probably will continue to do so. And she is going to liaison with our office of also communications and outreach at the Department of Education so that when it comes to press things, if you have got inquiries, you want to do press, certainly do not want any of you - we want everybody -I mean, you all are more than welcome to talk to the press at any time. It would be helpful for us to know what is going on and we can help coordinate that. Kristen will be the person to help do that.

So, that is a little bit. There are a couple of things in your briefing books that I wanted to just - sure.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Excuse me; let me add to that just real quickly, is Townsend still in the room?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

You met Townsend McNitt earlier; she is Townsend? the liaison to the Secretary and a Senior Consultant to the Department. She and Sally Stroup who you see sitting at the table - well, she just walked in. a grand entrance. And Townsend and Sally and Cheryl make up the Senior Staff of Advisors to the commission in a variety of different aspects and I encourage you to use any and all of them. Work with Cheryl when you can, from an organizational standpoint, but you will find that they are going to have different views and different sets of information and they are all anxious to help any way they can. And Samara works in the press office that helps us make the press contacts and if you need some help in any of those areas, contact any of the people we have talked about.

It will be a team effort; most everybody will be informed about what is happening. If you need advice and cannot find somebody, find the other one. And we will help in any way we can. We will have to develop some good communication systems with each other and I look for some advice about how to do that.

ROBERT ZEMSKY: Charles, I'm wondering. I don't carry more luggage than I need to, is there a way to get these in PDF?

CHERYL OLDHAM: Absolutely, Yep.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

ROBERT ZEMSKY: I don't know about others but whatever you can send me electronically. I won't carry this with me.

CHERYL OLDHAM: Absolutely, and you know what, you should not. Some of this information you might want to keep in hard copy. Some of it maybe you do not want and you can chunk it. Probably every meeting you are going to have a briefing book, and especially for the meetings coming up there will be presentations, there will be things that you will need to have in hard copy for you to look at and see while you are having a discussion. But, yeah, I mean, this is not something you need to carry from meeting to meeting and we will get everything in here that we think is useful to you in email form.

And one of the things that I encourage you - there is a commission roster and contact information and we have done the here, best using the information that you gave us to accurately reflect all of your contact information, your assistant's information. But I just encourage you to go over it with a fine-toothed comb and make sure that we have it all correct. And if not, please let us know because that is, obviously, most important that we know how to get in touch with one another.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Just a little kind of, just a couple more housekeeping things. We have set up a commission website at The Department of Education website and there is a little sheet in your briefing book that shows you how to get there. The other thing that we are talking about and would like to do is set up access to a password protected piece of the website just for commission and staff. Sort of pre-decisional deliberative nothing, some way that we can share information, post information, share information that way. So that is forthcoming. And any information, any suggestions that you all have as to how that can be useful to so that we set it up properly and that it is effective. Yes?

RICHARD STEPHENS: Where might we find that website location?

up. Oh, that is in Executive Director update, 3. Yes. It should be the web, there it is. ED.GOV, yes. And really, for the public, it is their way to comment. There is access there to go in and make their public comments by email to us. What we plan to do is compile all those public comments and get them to you all so you know what folks are saying. And, then also the, we have had a court reporter here, obviously that

2.3

is taking down everything that is said. We will post
the transcript. So it will be nice easy folks to
review and look back and see what was said.

GERRI ELLIOTT: I just wanted to note for
any recommendations since Nick and I are the two
technologists on the commission, that the two of us

CHERYL OLDHAM: I would love that.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Just get the legal counsel to tell us how to --

figure out what that part ought to be for us and just

GERRI ELLIOTT: We'll do it together, it will be fine.

CHERYL OLDHAM: Yes, thank you, thank you. Next meetings we have got Nashville set for December  $8^{th}$  and  $9^{th}$ . Ι apologize for the change location, we sort of ran into some issues in Atlanta that we did not anticipate. It being a big city we thought we could do a meeting there, and lo and behold they are booked. So we wanted to stay in the same region of the country, so therefore, we decided to go with Nashville so I apologize for any problems that may have caused for you. We do not have locations set for the rest of the meetings, but we plan to get that, we know that is important for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

get it done for us.

2 are doing. CHAIRMAN MILLER: Central U.S. or Midwest, 3 we would say, probably Southern California, and one 4 toward the Rockies would be what we are thinking 5 6 Not necessarily in big cities, but reasonably 7 We talked about not having them on accessible. college campuses because of all the people we would 8 have to say no to, but we are open if you have any 9 ideas about location. We always are interested in the 10 11 cost, but also convenience and flexibility for the 12 public to participate and not the other way around. 13 ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: Cheryl, a question, I 14 noticed I have an impression that we are supposed to make our travel arrangements through the government. 15 It is not okay to, this is logistical, just make our 16 17 own travel arrangements and --CHAIRMAN MILLER: Especially if you would 18 19 pay for it, I mean that would be --20 ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: Well --21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: We could do that. 22 CHERYL OLDHAM: If you are going to pay 2.3 for it yourself, you are more than happy to. The 24 problem is that the government gets government rates 25 and all of that and so we have to make them for you in

everybody to know where they are going and what they

order to pay for them. I think there is the ability for you to make your arrangements but we would only reimburse you for the cost of a government rate from A to B. So if you made a reservation that cost you \$800, we could get it for \$300 that is what we pay you for.

JAMES HUNT: But may we send you our suggestions about when we will travel?

CHERYL OLDHAM: Yes. Tracy Harris, who been working with, assistant has actually not officially part of the commission staff, but we work very closely with her. She is in the office of communications and outreach for Department of Education and she is handling all travel and logistical arrangements and she will deal with you directly or your assistants, however you prefer. if you have suggested ways you like to travel, out of what airports, that kind of stuff, she will work with you.

ROBERT ZEMSKY: Could you go over the rule

- this business of - I talked to Eleanor about it last
night. It is really hard when you buy the tickets and
send me a paper ticket and we worry about all the cost
of Fed Ex that if I have to change. Could you set it
up so that we just had, we were told what we would be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

1	reimbursed and let, at least those of us who would
2	like to, do it. Because I run a really complex one, I
3	am changing it all the time, and to have in the middle
4	of the trip a non-changeable ticket that I am not
5	responsible for is very awkward for me.
6	CHERYL OLDHAM: Okay. Let me work on that
7	for you. I will do that.
8	ROBERT ZEMSKY: I appreciate that.
9	ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: I second that; I think
10	that anything that gives us more flexibility is great.
11	CHERYL OLDHAM: Okay.
12	SARA MARTINEZ TUCKER: Particularly most
13	of us will do, we won't just do a round trip, and we
14	will work it into a swing. And when the middle of a
15	swing is not negotiable it makes it really tough. So
16	if you could just let us know what is the
17	reimbursable, we will make our own.
18	CHAIRMAN MILLER: We will make any of it
19	work that you need as long as it is legal.
20	ROBERT ZEMSKY: As we say in the markets,
21	Charles, as long as it is revenue neutral it ought to
22	be all right.
23	CHERYL OLDHAM: Right. That is all I
24	really have to say unless you all have additional
25	questions for me, we can move on.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: You get a bonus because you finished ahead of time.

CHERYL OLDHAM: Yes, that's on my - I'm going to introduce Gloria Mounts. She is the committee management officer for the Department of Education and she is our resident expert on all things Federal Advisory Committee Act, which is what we are, so, I will turn it over to Gloria.

GLORIA MOUNTS: Hello and welcome to the Department, I know you have been welcomed a lot today. Can everybody hear me or am I supposed to push? All right, push? Okay, AV? It worked for the Secretary, I bet.

CHERYL OLDHAM: I think it is on, Gloria.

GLORIA MOUNTS: Okay. This mic? Use it? Oh this one is on already? Can everyone hear me? okay. I am Gloria Mounts, the U.S. Department of Education Committee Management Officer. I work in Cheryl's office, recently moved there from the Office of Communications. It is my responsibility at the Department to help establish these advisory committees and manage and oversee the ones that we have in the department. We have about twelve Federal Advisory Committees now that are functioning in the Department of Education.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

In your brochures you will have a little This is a little fantastic overview that overview. our General Services Administration puts out that actually describes exactly what Federal Committees are, what the responsibilities of each Federal Agency is. I am just going to kind of go over and highlight some of the issues that are in this little brochure. But if you have any questions at all, after I give my little briefing, just ask them now or my name and telephone number and email are included in a small two page, I think it is two or three page, brief that I have prepared for you. Which I can also email to each of you once we get the emails all set up.

put in place a process for advisory committees to be established, managed, and maintained. Congress saw the way that, a way that the government could go out and seek advice from public citizens and wanted to put it in some kind of public law so that there would be some type of process and procedures that would be written down.

The President in 1977, I believe it was, put the responsibility of the oversight of all Federal Advisory Committees under the General Services

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Administration. That is why you see GSA's name is on our little overview pamphlet here.

GSA has a management secretariat office that maintains the accomplishments and a list of every Federal Advisory Committee that is operating currently for all the Federal Agencies in the Department. In the paperwork there is a website at GSA that you can go to if you are interested. It has information on FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act itself; it has a copy of the public law.

It has a copy of the Sunshine Act, which mandates our open and public meetings. The Sunshine Act is also there on the GSA website. And also GSA publishes a Federal Advisory Committee management rule, which actually just sets in place our process, and procedures that we have to obey under, from under the law. So, GSA has set these guidelines in place and it is all available on their website.

I had mentioned the three sources of reference material, the Federal Advisory Committee Act itself, is on the GSA website, the management rule is on the website, and so is the government and the Sunshine Act.

Briefly our committee management requirements for the Department of Education are: The

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

Department has to appoint, under the law, a committee management officer, which is myself, who as I have said is responsible for the establishment and the overseeing and the operating procedures for all of our committees. The Department of Education writes a charter, your charter was filed on October 14, which means that you may legally conduct business now. There should be a copy, I believe, of your charter in your charter in your briefing books. That is kind of your, it gives you information on your establishment, your membership, your authority, your termination, your reporting responsibilities and requirements, and things of that nature.

No Federal Advisory Committee can meet without a charter. Charters are, they have a lifetime of two years. GSA requires a two-year renewal of all Federal Advisory Committee charters. I believe your committee, you are considered an ad hoc committee, and you have a report that is due within that limited time. So we do not expect that this commission will be re-chartered, but if the Secretary has more work for this commission we have that availability to continue this commission by renewal of the charter.

The Department also appoints a Federal - it is called a Designated Federal Official, which

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

Cheryl is acting in that capacity now. The Secretary has named her the Executive Director of this commission. She will be the liaison person between the commission and the Department. Anything that you will need she will be able to take care of for you.

The DFO or the Designated Federal Official must be present at all your meetings. She has the authority to, over the Chair, to adjourn a meeting if something that she feels the meeting would get out of hand, she has that authority under her mandate by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, so she has the authority to adjourn meetings, she works with the chairperson on the agenda and takes care of all the logistics of the meeting and the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. She can call the meetings if the Chair cannot be at the meeting. She can also represent the Chair at the meeting.

The commission is required by the law to notify the public at least fifteen days in advance by publishing a Federal Register Notice in the Federal Register. Other means of notifying the public of your meetings is encouraged such as the website that we are currently preparing, your meetings will be posted on the website for the general public to know when you are meeting, when you are meeting, and probably a copy

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

of your transcripts will be available for the public to view on this website.

The commission must have a quorum of eight commissioners to meet. If you do not have eight commissioners you cannot officially have what consider a Federal Advisory Committee Meeting. can hold hearings and administrative type work if you divide into subcommittees, those subcommittees report meet but they must their findings and everything through the main commission at a regularly scheduled FACA meeting.

Commission meetings are always open to the public unless they are closed or partially closed in accordance to the exemptions in the Sunshine Act. Those basically are, if you are discussing nature's, let's say that there are three exemptions, let me see, I always - okay, those include deliberations involving considerations of personnel privacy and discussing, of course, any classified information that might not be available to the public, and if you are working on any data that is in support of Federal Grant application.

So, basically I think most of your meetings probably will be held in open sessions. And if you decide or you come to a conclusion that you

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

need to close a meeting for some reason, those requests come through our office of general counsel so that they can be, they can concur on the fact that you need to close this meeting in accordance to the exemptions in the Sunshine Act.

Minutes must be taken of all the meetings. These minutes include a record of all the persons present, an accurate description of the matters discussed at the meeting, including positions taken by individuals. Especially with respect to controversial issues. Copies of any papers that are presented at this meeting must be in the public domain. And anything that the commission, any recommendations that you may make or that you have voted on must be written into these meetings.

These minutes must be signed by the Chair within ninety days of your, of that initial meeting. He needs to verify these meetings and certify them. Each year the Committee Management Officer, myself, and the DFO issue an Annual Comprehensive Review of your accomplishments here. It is done through a database that is electronically established at the General Services Administration so you will, all your names will be listed under the membership.

Your accomplishments will be noted, the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

2.3

number of meetings that you held, whether they were open, closed, information on the budget will be available to the public through this FACA database that GSA has and the GSA website, if you wanted to view any of those reports, you just go to gsa.gov and hit search for Committee Management and you can pull up the FACA database and you can see an example of what those accomplishments look like.

You will not really be involved in any of that type of reporting. That will be handled by Cheryl and myself. But, if you are interested and want to see what anything looks like you are welcome to go there.

The commission may be away from Washington with the advanced approval of the Secretary. The reason that is stipulated in the FACA requirements is that because all of the meetings are normally held here in Washington. Some special committees need to meet throughout the United States but we just have to justify those meetings and get the Secretary to sign off on those. That is an administrative chore which Cheryl and I will work together on so that next meeting we will be doing a memo requesting the Secretary's approval.

Special provisions for this commission,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

you members are serving as representatives that will be discussed later in your ethics briefing on what role you play as a representative. It is different than a special government employee, which a lot of my Federal Advisory Committee members are. I think some of you here, there is a couple of you I recognize the names so you probably, might be serving in a different type role here.

You will serve for the life of this commission. This commission has a report and written recommendations and comments due by August 1, 2006 and according to your charter you will conduct at least three meetings in different parts of the country. This commission shall terminate thirty days after submitting its report, or unless the Secretary chooses to renew the charter and add specific, if something you need to work on after your recommendations.

My name is on the back on that last page, like I said. My telephone number here at the department is area code (202) 401-3677 and if you have any questions regarding FACA or anything else I can help you with please don't hesitate to call me. I would be happy to answer any questions at this point, if anyone has any.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Questions?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

ARTHUR ROTHKOPF: Maybe just one question.

What are the rules as to the openness or requirement for public publicity where individual's members or a smaller group than the entire commission may be meeting? Is there some cut off point where there is no requirement of public release?

As long as two or three GLORIA MOUNTS: people are meeting, say, to prepare for a larger Say you needed to do some background or meeting. research or come together to put together a report that you want to submit to the commission. Or, say you have a meeting come up in Nashville and you need to do some preliminary work to get ready for that That is okay. They discourage any kind of meeting. going on between two three business or members There is a fine line, and I am discussing business. sure our ethics office can probably explain this a little bit better, but there is a fine line where you cannot just sit around and discuss the business of the commission. And it is a very hard line to almost try to communicate.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think we will know more about that after our ethics briefing this afternoon, but thank you for asking, that's critical to our ability to function, so we will try to refine

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

GLORIA MOUNT: But any time you are just exchanging information or gathering information or exchanging information with a Federal Official that can be done without invoking FACA.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Any other questions? That brings us to the concluding part of Thank you. our meeting. This is a good time if somebody has other operational or organizational questions. are going to operate or things to bring up now, or we can do that as I ask in the next few days or over the next week. And when we finish this part of discussion we are going to adjourn. I will adjourn the meeting and I will ask everybody in the room except the Commission and the staff to leave and we have an ethics briefing at that time. Any comments about how to go forward, suggestions?

RICHARD STEPHENS: Charles I do not have a question on the operational side, nor relative to FACA, but I do have an observation and I do not know how we are going to handle it from a commission standpoint, but certainly we are going to spend a considerable time looking at the items that are outlined and we talked about earlier.

My sense is one of the areas, and a few

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

people hit around a little bit, that relate to our work is in fact about what is going on from a social fabric from America that is impacting education on all It is the motivation, the attitudes, and all elements that impact people's perspectives, therefore their attitudes and therefore their behavior.

We have not had any discussion and I just want to plant the seed that we can create the lake that we want people to come drink the water from, but unless they are ready to go drink we may not be successful in our deliberations. And I just wanted to put that on the table as, I think, an important part of the discussion of this commission.

A different kind of ROBERT ZEMSKY: To make sure that we actually have some common data, just a suggestion as Governor Hunt brought it up, so I presume he can commit to the center that he is Chair of. But there is a pretty good briefing book out of Pat's Center that I think could and should be made available to all of us and it ought to include state-by-state data, because if you know this game, there is a whole lot of difference between any two states that you want to mention.

And so we have to be careful that we look

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

at the variance. It is not just the report card itself, there is actually a fact book, I think they call it. And, again, if it was made available as PDF format rather than hard copy, it would be very helpful and we could have ready access to it. But, at least provide one common place to start the number discussion.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. We have identified that and Pat Callan has a very important source for the commission, about half a dozen people like that. We have a very strong National reputation who have data, who have published recent reports, and we are going to try to refine those things in the sense of not overwhelming you with that, but make some judgment about passing that on to you. That is a good example of it.

And I expect you all to have the same ability, so we have to remember when we pass that through each other's hands that we do not want to overwhelm each other either. But, we should get common data and we will have to be discerning about which gets in which hands. One of the ways to do that is if we subdivide the group a little more, which is what I would like to start to do. But I would say uniformly everybody would get some minimum amount of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.3

data through this process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

And like I said I have found, depending on how you would count it, six to eight people who could be consultants to the commission a number of whom would not necessarily be paid directly but who would serve in a relative formal capacity who would expect to bring to the meetings to brief us or to meet with a smaller group in whatever legal capacity we could do on those topics.

JAMES HUNT: Charles, if I may say this, Arturo Madrid and I both serve on the Board of the National Center on Public Policy in Higher Education and we do have a lot of what I think is very good data, much of it over ten years, on accessibility, affordability, accountability, and preparation of course. And I would think this would be one of the important things that we would work from and we want all of you to have it.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Ι agree. Ιt incomplete on student learning, but they are moving forward on that. The last report that came out last week had some movement on that, too. So they have done some remarkably good state policy work. have found some good institutional accountability have an A Team on this commission for work.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 accessibility, part of it for accountability, for 2 affordability. So the commission itself has a lot of that knowledge. We want to identify the kind of 3 consultants that could benefit in 4 us our 5 deliberations. So, more advice on that still would be 6 helpful. 7 ROBERT ZEMSKY: But, Charles, just so that at least what I asked for was clear, I am not, I make 8 a distinction between the report card and the fact 9 book. 10 11 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Full database, I heard 12 you. Okay, so that it is the 13 ROBERT ZEMSKY: 14 reports are interesting, I think they always carry the interpretive cast, as they should. But I have worked 15 16 Pat's data, and it is just good, 17 collected it, he was very, very assiduous in collecting it and it would be really helpful to us, 18 19 basic database. 20 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Got it. 21 RICHARD VEDDER: Charles, I assume if, for 22 example, the new Digest of Educational Statistics is 2.3 out 2004 and if I see something, say in Table 327 or something and it looks particularly provocative or 24

something I can let Cheryl or someone know and then a

1	Judgment call will be made whether to pass that on to
2	the full commission or is that something we should
3	just pass on ourselves?
4	CHAIRMAN MILLER: I would rather you send
5	it and editorialize it. But you could do it through
6	Cheryl to organize it and anything you could add in an
7	editorial comment would be helpful. I think we should
8	
9	RICHARD VEDDER: So we could do this on
10	our directly with all the commissioners.
11	CHAIRMAN MILLER: It is up to you. I
12	think that process can work and -
13	RICHARD VEDDER: Either way.
14	CHAIRMAN MILLER: If it gets to be a log
15	jam or if it would help the information flow then we
16	will just have to adjust, but I recommend that to
17	begin with.
18	CHERYL OLDHAM: And if you will include me
19	on anything that you send it would be good just so we
20	know.
21	CHAIRMAN MILLER: Oh, copy the staff,
22	yeah. Well, thank you, I would like to ask you to
23	stay seated for a moment so we can be briefed on the
24	ethics side. I would like to ask everyone but the
25	staff from the Department to clear the room

1	immediately and the meeting, therefore, now stands
2	adjourned.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
4	concluded at 2:13 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	